DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 038 366 24 SP 003 808

AUTHOR Dobson, Russell; Hawkins, Sue
TITLE The Perception and Treatment by Student Teachers of the Behavioral Problems of Elementary School Children.
INSTITUTION Oklahoma State Univ., Stillwater.
BUREAU NO BR-9-G-106
PUB DATE Jan 70
GRANT OEG-7-9-460016-0105(010)
NOTE 165p.

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.75 HC-$8.35
DESCRIPTORS *Behavior Problems, Behavior Standards, *Changing Attitudes, *Elementary School Students, *Sensitivity Training, *Student Teachers, Teacher Attitudes

ABSTRACT

This study used a random assignment pretest posttest control group design to measure the influence of sensitivity training on student teachers' perception and treatment of behavior problems of elementary school children. The control group received the traditional student teacher training, while the experimental group received, in addition, nine sensitivity training sessions. Half of each group was assigned to low socioeconomic status schools and half to other socioeconomic status schools. Analysis of pre- and posttest data from the Behavioral Problems Inventory and the Behavioral Treatment Response Sheet indicates that there is no significant difference between the control group and the experimental group in perception or treatment of behavioral problems in general, but that there is some difference in their perception of behavior problems in relation to socioeconomic status of the school. The major recommendation is that teacher education should emphasize the psycho-social aspect of child development and a flexible growth. (Appendixes contain copies of the two tests used and a selected bibliography.) (RT)

ED038366

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

FINAL REPORT
Project No. 9-G-016
Grant No. OEG-7-9-460016-0105-(010)

THE PERCEPTION AND TREATMENT BY STUDENT TEACHERS OF THE BEHAVIORAL PROBLEMS OF ELEMENTARY SCHOOL CHILDREN

Russell Dobson and Sue Hawkins
Oklahoma State University

Stillwater, Oklahoma
January, 1970

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a contract with the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under government sponsorship express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

SP003808

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	Background Information	1
	Justification for the Study	9
	The Purpose of the Study	10
	Basic Hypotheses	12
	Definition of Terms	13
	Major Assumptions	16
	Limitations	18
	Summary and Organization of the Study	19
II.	REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	20
	Introduction	20
	Teacher Attitudes Toward Pupil Behavior	21
	Conflict and Change in Attitudes Toward Discipline	25
	Socio-Economic Level and Child Behavior	38
	A Changing Teacher Education	45
	Summary	54
III.	INVESTIGATION PROCEDURES	55
	Experimental Design	55
	Timing and Analysis	57
	Population and Sample	58
	Instrumentation	59
	Behavioral Problems Inventory	60
	Behavioral Treatment Response Sheet	61
	The Independent Variable	65
	Summary	71
IV.	AN ANALYSIS AND TREATMENT OF DATA	73
	Introduction	73
	The Behavioral Problems Inventory	76
	The Behavioral Treatment Response Sheet	99
	Summary	113

Chapter Page

V. INTRODUCTORY SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, FURTHER CONSIDERATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 114

Introductory Summary 114
Findings 115
Conclusions 119
Further Considerations 122
Recommendations 125
Recommendations for Further Research 126

A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY 128

APPENDIX A - BEHAVIORAL PROBLEMS INVENTORY 136

APPENDIX B - BEHAVIORAL TREATMENT RESPONSE SHEET 138

APPENDIX C - ADMINISTRATION INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE BEHAVIORAL PROBLEMS INVENTORY AND THE BEHAVIORAL PROBLEMS TREATMENT SHEET 140

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
I.	The Perceived Level-of-Seriousness Weighted Total Scores For the Experimental Group as Measured by the B.P.I. . .	79
II.	The Perceived Level-of-Seriousness Weighted Total Scores For the Control Group as Measured by the B.P.I.	81
III.	Subject Change Scores and Coded Change Scores for the Experimental and the Control Group	82
IV.	Rank Ordering of Student Teacher Perception of the Level-of-Seriousness of Behavioral Acts Performed By Children in Kindergarten Through Grade Six	85
V.	Pre-Test and Post-Test Change in the Perceived Levels-of-Seriousness of Behavioral Problems For the Experimental Group	89
VI.	Pre-Test and Post-Test Change in the Perceived Levels-of-Seriousness of Behavioral Problems For the Control Group	91
VII.	Total B.P.I. Responses Reflecting Perceived Levels-of-Seriousness of Behavioral Problems and Obtained Chi-Square Values by Student Teachers in Designated Socio-Economic Status Schools	98
VIII.	Behavioral Problems Treatment Post-Test Summary Categorized by Desirable and Undesirable Treatments By the Experimental Group and the Control Group	102
IX.	Total Experimental and Control Group Responses Showing Choice of Desirable Treatments Listed On the B.T.R.S. Pre-Test and Post-Test	105
X.	Total Experimental and Control Group Responses Showing Choice of Undesirable Treatments Listed On the B.T.R.S. Pre-Test and Post-Test	106
XI.	A Comparison of the Experimental Group and the Control Group on Pre-Test and Post-Test Responses for Each Behavioral Treatment Listed on the B.T.R.S.	110

Table

Page

XII. Total B.T.R.S. Responses Categorized as Desirable and Undesirable Proposed Treatments of Behavioral Problems And Obtained Chi-Square Scores by Student Teachers in Designated Socio-Economic Status Schools 112

SUMMARY

Research in social psychology has determined, or at least implied, that beginning teachers experience difficulty in dealing with the behavioral problems of elementary school age children. Pupil control, the perception of pupil misbehavior and subsequent teacher selected techniques of prevention or treatment appear to be an integral part of teaching behavior in the public elementary school. Teacher-pupil control typology may vary from custodial to humanistic as discussed by Willower, Eidell, and Hoy (1967, p. 4) who stated:

> Teachers may emphasize punitive sanctions, coercion, and ridicule as well as withholding rewards to gain compliance to arbitrary standards set by the teacher or the organization. Or sensitive teachers may appeal to the individuals' senses of right and wrong, his self-discipline in a non-punitive, understanding, and supportive manner to achieve behavior norms and role expectations.

If appropriate pupil control is vital to success in teaching elementary school youth, and if humane understanding and perception leading to pupils' developing self-adequacy and a good self-concept is important, it behooves educators to determine if secure, sensitive, perceptive teachers trained in human relations are essential. Educators must also determine if opportunities for such preparation now exist in pre-service education.

Within the last ten years basic characteristics of student teachers have changed. Modern student teachers have more universal attributes than did the student teacher stereotypes of a decade or so ago. Recently prepared teachers represent more nearly the total range in

terms of socio-economic background. Their preparation is more complete, in that they have college degrees with balanced course work in the foundations of education, methods of education, and adequate academic preparation.

In other words, student teachers prepared in the last decade seem to be highly professional and cosmopolitan. Consequently, one of the major concerns of this investigation was to find out whether the conclusions derived from research a decade or so ago are still tenable.

Though it may be concluded that teachers prepared within the last ten years are well prepared professionally and possess desirable social perceptions, the intensity, complexity, and depth of problems which are associated with children have at the same time become more crystallized.

So again, while modern student teachers may be better prepared to cope with behavioral problems than their more experienced counterparts, the intensity and complexity of the problems within children have increased.

In any event, the teacher variable and the pupil variable have changed in the last decade. Such changes are worthy of new analysis. Furthermore, this investigation is based on the premise that perception and behavior rooted in attitudes and beliefs does not change as a consequence of communication; therefore student teachers need an opportunity to expose and explore their own ideas and feelings in a supportive atmosphere.

Hypotheses

The central problem of this study was to determine whether student teachers who participate in intensive human relations laboratory training in conjunction with the student teaching experience and student

teachers who participate in the traditional student teaching experience differ in their perception of behavioral problems and their proposed treatment of children who exhibit such behavioral problems. Answers to the following questions which generated specific hypotheses were sought:

1. Do elementary school student teachers who participate in intensive human relations laboratory experiences differ significantly from elementary school student teachers who participate only in the traditional student teaching program in their perception of what constitutes pupil misbehavior?
2. Were these two groups of elementary school student teachers in substantial agreement concerning proposed treatment for children who exhibit misbehavior?
3. Do student teachers' attitudes toward behavioral problems exhibited by children change significantly as a result of intensive human relations laboratory experiences?
4. Do student teachers assigned to differing socio-economic status school environments differ in their level-of-seriousness perception of the behavioral problems of elementary school children as a result of intensive human relations laboratory experience?
5. Do student teachers assigned to differing socio-economic status school environments differ in their proposed treatment of the behavioral problems of elementary school children as a result of intensive human relations laboratory experience?

Instrumentation

In order to answer the foregoing questions and to test the

specific hypotheses, it was necessary to measure the attitudes and practices of a large number of elementary school student teachers toward behavioral problems of their pupils. The selected instrument utilized for both the pre-test and post-test was the Behavioral Problems Inventory and the Behavioral Treatment Response Sheet created by Dobson (1966). This instrument was based upon studies reported by Wickman (1929) and others who reported misbehavior types common to elementary school children and who compiled and validated lists of acts perceived by teachers as misbehavior. Two lines of inquiry were pursued to obtain evidence of student teacher perception and proposed treatment of behavioral problems of the elementary school children involved in the study. First, the reactions of participating student teachers to specific types of behavioral problems were measured by eliciting their judgments about the seriousness of the problems listed in the Behavioral Problems Inventory (B.P.I.). The response categories were scored high, medium, or low. Second, the participating student teachers' attitudes toward treatment of these behavioral problems were ascertained by analyzing the Behavioral Treatment Response Sheet (B.T.R.S.).

Design

Eighty elementary school student teachers were divided randomly into two groups of forty each; of which one, the experimental group, was exposed to student teaching and the independent variable. The control group was not exposed to other than the traditional student teaching experience. To control for geographic and social conditions which might intervene in this investion, Oklahoma's two largest metropolitan cities' educational facilities were used as cooperating school

systems. From each city's forty student teacher assignees, twenty were randomly assigned to experience student teaching in lower socio-economic schools and twenty assigned to other socio-economic schools. Comprising the total experimental group from each metropolitan location were ten elementary school student teachers assigned to lower socio-economic status schools (Title I) and ten elementary student teacher assignees from other socio-economic status schools (not Title I). Thus an experimental group of forty elementary student teachers was developed. The remaining forty elementary student teachers comprised the control group.

The independent variable was the intensive human relations laboratory experiences in addition to the traditional student teaching. The structural aspects of the human relations laboratory experiences took the form of the following processes:

1. The exposing (verbally and nonverbally) of one's own ideas and feelings to other student teachers.
2. Receiving feedback (interaction with other group members).
3. The exploration of one's own beliefs, attitudes, values, and resultant behaviors.
4. The examination of teaching problems which caused student teachers to initiate behaviors to cope with the problems.
5. A supportive atmosphere without personal threat or authority.
6. The leader(s) offered a supportive attitude of encouragement and acceptance but did not supply "ready" answers to participants.

These experiences were to assist student teachers in recognizing individual differences, needs, and levels of awareness in themselves

and in others. It must be recognized that the participants were normal student teachers; consequently, the group was not a depth psychotherapy unit.

The data collected for this study were analyzed through the use of appropriate statistical techniques with statistical significance established at the .05 level of confidence.

Results

The data in Table I show a rank ordering of the behavioral acts from the B.P.I. according to the perceived level-of-seriousness by the elementary student teachers in the experimental group and the control group. The table presents both the pre-test and the post-test weighted score rankings for each listed behavioral act.

Both the experimental and the control groups were in substantial agreement regarding acts considered serious. The data show physical attack on the teacher, sex offense, no interest in classwork, unhappiness and depression, rages and temper tantrums, cruelty and bullying, willful disobedience, truancy, lying and untruthfulness, committing petty thievery, defacing school property, cheating on class assignments and/or tests, and general rudeness and inconsideration for other students, as having been ranked overall by both groups and on the pre-test and post-test, between 1.5 and 14 in order of perceived level-of-seriousness. These acts were considered to be serious behavioral problems by all student teachers involved in the investigation.

The behavioral problem acts listed on the B.P.I. generally deemed of least level-of-seriousness rank were: horseplay, eating candy, etc., in school, slovenly appearance, daydreaming, acting smart, stubbornness and contrariness, tattling on others, interrupting, whispering and

TABLE I

RANK ORDERING OF STUDENT TEACHER PERCEPTION OF THE LEVEL-OF-SERIOUSNESS OF BEHAVIORAL ACTS PERFORMED BY CHILDREN IN KINDERGARTEN THROUGH GRADE SIX

Behavioral Problems	Experimental Group		Control Group	
	Pre-test Rank	Post-test Rank	Pre-test Rank	Post-test Rank
Running in the hall	31	30	27	28.5
General rudeness and inconsideration for other students	12.5 *	7 *	8.5 *	9 *
Cheating on class assignments and/or tests	3 *	7 *	12.5 *	11 *
Defacing school property and/or equipment	6 *	1.5 *	1 *	1.5 *
Habitual tardiness	21.5	19	23	19
Committing petty thievery	4 *	1.5 *	2 *	1.5 *
Lying, untruthfulness	10.5 *	12 *	5 *	10 *
Masturbation	26	26	19.5	21
Truancy	12.5 *	9 *	8.5 *	7 *
Swearing, using profane language	21.5	26	22	21
Smoking	14	16	16.5	15
Obscene notes, talk	15.5	17	18	16
Playing with genitalia	18.5	21.5	19.5	17.5
Disorderliness in classroom	26	20	28.5	26
Whispering, writing notes	26	34	37	35.5
Interrupting	32	28.5	30	30.5
Failure to pay attention	21.5	15	21	17.5
Carelessness, inaccuracy in work	17	18	16.5	21
Physical laziness	18.5	23	25.5	24
Willful disobedience	8.5 *	3.5 *	6 *	6 *
Cruelty, bullying	7 *	13 *	11 *	13 *
Quarrelsomeness	21.5	21.5	25.5	24
Tattling on others	28	31.5	33	32

TABLE I (Continued)

Behavioral Problems	Experimental Group		Control Group	
	Pre-test Rank	Post-test Rank	Pre-test Rank	Post-test Rank
Stubbornness, contrariness	27	24	24	28.5
Rages, temper tantrums	10.5 *	11 *	10 *	12 *
Rudeness, impudence to teachers	24	14	14	14
Shyness, timidity, withdrawing	15.5	26	15	24
Acting smart	29	28.5	28.5	27
Unhappiness, depression	1 *	10 *	7 *	4.5 *
Daydreaming	30	31.5	31	30.5
Slovenly appearance	33.5	36	32	33.5
Sissy or tomboy	35	37	34.5	35.5
No interest in classwork	5 *	5 *	12.5 *	8 *
Sex offense	2 *	7 *	4 *	4.5 *
Eating candy, etc. in school	36	35	34.5	37
"Horseplay"	33.5	33	36	33.5
Physical attack on teacher	8.5 *	3.5 *	3 *	3 *

*Rank of behavioral problems in order of perceived level-of-seriousness. Items ranked by both groups on the pre-test and on the post-test from rank one to rank fourteen show high seriousness agreement.

writing notes, and running in the hall.

A further analysis of behavioral problems was undertaken to determine if there was any statistically significant change in either group of subjects occurring between the pre-test and the post-test on any specific behavioral problem item, in case chance changes distributed equally in both directions had balanced out the thirty-seven items and resulted in little evidence of total group change.

Tables II and III present the data as it was analyzed by the McNemar Test for Significance of Changes for each sample group. The data are categorized in these tables as they were statistically placed in the fourfold contingency table for test and each cell of the table is identified as to the respective contingency cell A, B, C, and D. Those behavioral problems which evidenced statistically significant change at or beyond the .05 confidence level are identified by an asterisk.

Table IV lists all treatment selections for each group and shows the itemized chi-square values or the Fisher's exact probability for each treatment item. Statistical significance between groups on each treatment is shown in the column at the right of the table by an asterisk. Chi-square obtained values and Fisher's exact probabilities are also presented in the table. Only two of the twenty-two treatment items showed statistical significance between the pre-test and the post-test. They were item number 10, pupil loses some privilege, in which the experimental group increased with the control decreased on their post-tests; and item number 11, pupil referred to special service personnel, in which the experimental group slightly decreased and the control group slightly increased.

TABLE II

PRE-TEST AND POST-TEST CHANGE IN THE PERCEIVED LEVELS-OF-SERIOUSNESS OF BEHAVIORAL PROBLEMS FOR THE EXPERIMENTAL GROUP

Behavioral Problems	Cell A Changed High to Low	Cell D Changed Low to High	Cell B No Change High	Cell C No Change Low	Obtained X^2	Significance Level
Running in the hall	8	9	5	18	0.00	
General rudeness and inconsideration for other students	11	1	21	7	6.750 *	.01
Cheating on class assignments and/or tests	17	1	18	4	12.50 *	.001
Defacing school property and/or equipment	17	2	18	3	10.32 *	.01
Habitual tardiness	11	2	15	12	4.92 *	.05
Committing petty thievery	10	0	26	4	8.10 *	.01
Lying, untruthfulness	11	0	24	5	.909	.50
Masturbation	15	4	6	15	5.27 *	.05
Truancy	16	1	16	7	11.53 *	.001
Swearing, using profane language	13	4	13	10	3.17	.10
Smoking	17	1	14	8	12.50 *	.001
Obscene notes, talk	14	2	16	8	7.56 *	.01
Playing with genitalia	16	0	8	16	14.06 *	.001
Disorderliness in classroom	7	9	13	11	.63	.80
Whispering, writing notes	7	13	2	18	1.25	.30
Interrupting	5	15	8	12	4.05 *	.05
Failure to pay attention	7	6	19	8	11.07 *	.001
Carelessness, inaccuracy in work	10	7	15	8	.235	.70
Physical laziness	15	6	9	10	3.047	.10
Willful disobedience	13	0	20	7	11.07 *	.001
Cruelty, bullying	14	1	20	5	9.60 *	.01
Quarrelsomeness	9	2	17	12	3.27	.10

TABLE II (Continued)

Behavioral Problems	Cell A Changed High to Low	Cell D Changed Low to High	Cell B No Change High	Cell C No Change Low	Obtained X^2	Significance Level
Tattling on others	10	10	11	9	0.00	
Stubbornness, contrariness	7	9	12	12	.0625	.90
Rages, temper tantrums	12	3	20	5	4.266 *	.05
Rudeness, impudence to teachers	11	1	21	7	6.75 *	.01
Shyness, timidity, withdrawing	14	2	14	10	7.56 *	.01
Acting smart	3	9	14	14	2.08	.20
Unhappiness, depression	12	2	24	2	4.785 *	.05
Daydreaming	10	6	6	18	.563	.50
Slovenly appearance	11	3	2	24	4.57 *	.05
Sissy or tomboy	8	3	3	26	1.45	.30
No interest in classwork	14	1	20	5	9.60 *	.01
Sex offense	14	0	21	5	12.07 *	.001
Eating candy, etc. in school	4	8	2	26	.750	.50
"Horseplay"	6	10	4	20	.563	.50
Physical attack on teacher	8	1	27	4		p=.044*

*Significant at the .05 level of confidence.

TABLE III

PRE-TEST AND POST-TEST CHANGE IN THE PERCEIVED LEVELS-OF-SERIOUSNESS OF BEHAVIORAL PROBLEMS FOR THE CONTROL GROUP

Behavioral Problems	Cell A Changed High to Low	Cell D Changed Low to High	Cell B No Change High	Cell C No Change Low	Obtained X^2	Significance Level
Running in the hall	5	9	6	20	.6428	.50
General rudeness and inconsideration for other students	11	9	15	5	.0500	.90
Cheating on class assignments and/or test	11	8	15	6	.2105	.70
Defacing school property and/or equipment	7	2	27	4		p=.224
Habitual tardiness	8	9	10	13	.0588	.90
Committing petty thievery	9	4	25	2	1.231	.30
Lying, untruthfulness	15	7	14	4	2.227	.50
Masturbation	13	8	7	12	.7619	.70
Truancy	11	8	16	5	2.105	.50
Swearing, using profane language	11	10	8	11	0.00	
Smoking	13	13	8	6	0.00	
Obscene notes, talk	7	10	14	9	.2352	.90
Playing with genitalia	12	8	9	11	.4500	.70
Disorderliness in classroom	4	11	8	17	2.400	.50
Whispering	8	10	0	22	.0555	.90
Interrupting	9	11	3	17	.2000	.70
Failure to pay attention	12	11	9	8	0.00	
Carelessness, inaccuracy in work	12	8	9	11	.4500	.70
Physical laziness	8	11	6	15	.2105	.70
Willful disobedience	10	7	17	6	.2352	.70
Cruelty, bullying	14	7	13	6	1.714	.20
Quarrelsomeness	6	8	10	16	.0714	.80

TABLE III (Continued)

Behavioral Problems	Cell A Changed High to Low	Cell D Changed Low to High	Cell B No Change High	Cell C No Change Low	Obtained X^2	Significance Level
Tattling on others	4	8	4	24	.7500	.50
Stubbornness, contrariness	9	7	8	16	.0625	.90
Rages, temper tantrums	15	10	11	4	.6400	.80
Rudeness, impudence to teachers	12	8	11	9	.4500	.70
Shyness, timidity, withdrawing	16	4	9	11	6.050 *	.02
Acting smart	8	10	6	16	.0555	.90
Unhappiness, depression	13	2	22	3	6.666 *	.01
Daydreaming	8	11	4	17	.2105	.70
Slovenly appearance	5	3	5	27		p=.547
Sissy or tomboy	9	8	1	22	0.00	
No interest in classwork	8	11	16	5	.2105	.70
Sex offense	11	3	23	3	3.500	.10
Eating candy, etc. in school	0	6	1	33		p=.032*
"Horseplay"	3	6	4	27		p=.732
Physical attack on teacher	10	1	25	4	5.818 *	.02

*Significant at .05 level of confidence.

TABLE IV

A COMPARISON OF THE EXPERIMENTAL GROUP AND THE CONTROL GROUP ON PRE-TEST AND POST-TEST RESPONSES FOR EACH BEHAVIORAL TREATMENT LISTED ON THE B.T.R.S.

Desirable Treatments	Experimental Group		Control Group		Obtained X^2	Fisher's Exact Probability
	Pre-test	Post-test	Pre-test	Post-test		
1. Give pupil opportunity to make contribution to class	133	80	132	84	.0339	
3. Teacher uses simple control (a look, nod of head, etc.)	122	117	112	146	2.6045	
4. Parent-teacher conference	165	136	189	149	.0397	
7. Pupil-teacher conference	335	472	416	578	.00944	
10. Pupil loses some privilege	30	54	57	40	8.6791 *	
11. Pupil referred to special service personnel	86	68	4	41	29.12808*	
14. Role playing	37	39	32	35	.00330	
15. Isolate the pupil	9	25	3	6	.00009	p= .57448
16. Emphasize good qualities of child's behavior	89	64	48	37	.01376	
17. Accept misbehavior as normal for child and attempt to change through a positive approach	192	122	182	100	.59360	
22. Assess and improve through group discussions	123	133	97	116	.20137	
Undesirable Treatments						
2. Pupil apologizes	58	51	62	42	.64615	
5. Teacher lowers grade	4	7	3	2		p= .73074

TABLE IV (Continued)

Undesirable Treatments	Experimental Group		Control Group		Obtained X^2	Fisher's Exact Probability
	Pre-test	Post-test	Pre-test	Post-test		
6. Detention after school	8	4	13	3		p= .65502
8. Pupil temporarily suspended from room	2	11	5	5		p= .16034
9. Pupil temporarily suspended from school	0	1	27	0		p= .07142
12. Corporal punishment is used	3	4	4	7		p=1.00
13. Send child to principal's office	43	47	23	33	.38528	
18. Physical control of student	21	15	17	19	.50144	
19. Require additional assignment	4	4	4	5		p=1.00
20. Some action by fellow students	20	7	26	10	.0151	
21. Behavior called to attention of other class members	5	13	6	23		p=1.00

*Significant at the .05 level of confidence.

Findings

The findings of this study considered to be most significant were the following:

1. Differences in perception of the seriousness of behavioral problems between the experimental and control group were not significant.
2. Differences in the proposed treatment of behavioral problems between the experimental and control group were not significant.
3. Student teacher placement in lower and other socio-economic status elementary schools was a significant variable in the perception but not in the treatment of behavioral problems.
4. The experimental group showed significant change in the perceived level-of-seriousness on twenty-two of the thirty-seven behavioral problems while the control group indicated significant perceived level-of-seriousness changes on only four behavioral problems.
5. The treatments--pupil-teacher conference, the parent-teacher conference, assessment and group discussion of problems, and acceptance of behavior as normal--were utilized greatly by both the experimental group and the control group.
6. Significant differences existed between the pre-test and post-test for the experimental and control group on two desirable treatments: pupil loses some privilege and pupil referred to special service personnel.

Conclusions

The following conclusions have been drawn from the findings of

this study:

1. Since the experimental group received the treatment variable and the perceived level-of-seriousness on twenty-two individual behavioral problems changed significantly, one may suggest that the treatment variable may have had an effect upon some experimental group elementary school student teachers.
2. There was indication that the Oklahoma State University student teachers exhibited humanistic attitudes which were reflected by desirable action treatments of behavior problems in that there was no significant difference between the control group and the experimental group and that both groups selected frequently desirable behavioral problems treatments.
3. The increased emphasis upon child growth and development by teacher preparation institutions has been reflected in the attitudes of most of the Oklahoma State University student teacher candidates in this sample, because the pre-test and post-test responses showed no statistically significant differences in the selected treatments and both groups generally selected desirable behavioral problem treatments.
4. Student teachers in this sample appear to be cognizant of desirable procedures, as expressed in educational research literature, for treating behavioral problems of elementary school children because they generally selected educative treatments.
5. Oklahoma State University student teachers in this sample appear to accept children in terms of the social and behavioral standards of childhood and situation and do not attempt

to determine behavior solely using personal standards of deportment.

Recommendations

1) Elementary school student teachers need a broader background in psychological, sociological and philosophical bases for educational direction.

2) Elementary school student teachers need a variety of desirable strategies for dealing with child behavioral problems which afford positive results and which recognize the inherent worth and dignity of the individual.

3) Elementary school student teachers need opportunity to counsel with special services personnel and to know of those services which are available for assisting in the identification and/or solution of child behavioral problems.

Recommendations For Further Research

1) The validity and the findings of this study should be substantiated through additional investigations utilizing the intensive human relations laboratory experiences with student teachers.

2) Further research should identify the dimensions of human relations skills needed and the extent to which the elementary school student teacher of today has a theoretical and practical knowledge of such skills.

3) The relation of socio-economic strata to child behavior patterns in the dynamic social structures of current America merits continuing attention.

4) Research identifying "deviate" behavior and teacher concepts

of causative factors in the current American elementary school might afford information relative to the increasing incidence of attacks upon teachers.

5) Research relating the effects of T-group experiences upon the perception and treatment of behavioral problems of elementary school student teachers should prove valuable in developing teacher education programs psychologically orientated toward humanizing the elementary school.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background Information

The behavioral problems of elementary school children are topics of interest and major concern for public school educators. Teachers, student teachers, and principals are concerned with pupil behavior because effective teaching-learning may not occur in school and classroom social systems whose dimensions and modifications are not conducive to developing cooperative pupil behaviors and socialized individuals.

Bany and Johnson (1964) have pointed out that a knowledge of group behavior is increasingly recognized as a necessary part of the elementary school teacher's professional knowledge. Most public school teaching is done in a group situation and elementary school teachers must be skilled in classroom group management in order to develop, maintain, and to guide the classroom social system. The teacher's ability to apply this knowledge and to develop a social system made up of individuals that exhibit cohesiveness, that have good morale, and that work cooperatively toward desirable goals is an ingredient in progress toward curricular learning and concomitant educational aims.

Nelson and Thompson (1963) suggest that elementary school social systems are, in a large sense, developed and maintained by teachers and

principals. These are the personnel who set up and control in some manner, the physical, the social, and the psychological environments which create the behavioral mood or climate which may foster either appropriate or inappropriate behavioral patterns in elementary school pupils.

Gibson (1968) infers that appropriate and acceptable behavior in the middle class socio-economic group requires that individual pupils perceive the difference between socially acceptable and socially unacceptable values and choose the former. It often requires that the individual deny himself the privilege of satisfying immediately his primary needs. Acceptable behavior may be characterized by an ability to establish friendly, cooperative relationships with a reasonable number of associates and the ability to behave in such a manner that others will not be annoyed or offended. It is the socialized pupil that learns to seek goals which align with the value systems of the social systems of the classroom, the school, and also of larger systems. Inappropriate or problem behavior, in a societal system, may be an inability to meet the demands of the environment, an inability to get along with others, an inability to achieve self-reliance or an inability to adhere to a value system prescribed by that societal system.

According to Otto (1949) the established professional elementary teacher and the neophyte student teacher are concerned with the classroom behavior of children from all socio-economic levels and with pupil control success, not solely because the teaching-learning task is facilitated but because the professional success or failure of many elementary school teachers, student teachers, and principals is often gauged by the expertise exhibited in the control of pupils under their

supervision and legal charge.

Kimbrough (1968) suggests that pupil behavioral control is a complex phenomenon within the social systems of the classroom and of the school and may not be considered as entirely dependent simply upon environmental conditions. Pupil control in these social systems would seem to be highly dependent also upon effective teacher leadership which promotes healthy classroom climates in congruity with healthy individuals.

However, Oliva (1956) has cautioned educators that restraint must be exercised in judging pupil behavioral control to be the direct and simple result of teaching behaviors because pupil behaviors may be influenced by such other variables as:

1. The physical, mental, social and emotional factors within the pupil himself caused by nutritional conditions, underachievement and feelings of security or insecurity.
2. A hostile climate of interrelations in which teachers themselves create disciplinary problems by poor teaching methods, or by a lack of knowledge concerning human growth and development patterns.
3. Differential factors in the home and the community related to the family background and to the elders as well as to the socio-economic level of the environment.

Educators should be cognizant of such variables because the teaching-learning process spans not only the academic objectives but may encompass a wide variety of nonacademic pupil needs. Many of the teacher's pupil control problems may have their locus in human relationships and interactions relating to idiosyncratic pupil needs.

There is apparent confusion among educators concerning the variables related to pupil behavior and concerning the locus of control. On the one hand, the individual is considered totally responsible for behavior and on the other hand the social group interactions are considered as being a vital variable. In the latter vein, Bradford, Benne, and Lippett (1948) have called the attention of educators to the notion that a greater understanding of classroom group behavior and those complex forces of interactions might bring about greater teacher control of individuals in processes of learning.

Certainly, it is within the school and classroom social systems that teachers and pupils interact and where effective teacher leadership and environmental conditions become of collective importance in developing and establishing a climate fostering desirable group control and desirable individual behavior. This climate, rapport, and spirit that permeates a school and its classrooms may be built up over a period of years according to Crow and Crow (1956, p. 330) who stated:

> The standards of a school help build the reputation of the school, the school's tradition, in turn, works for the benefit of the school. It is easy to develop self discipline in situations, in which for years, good behavior has been the accepted practice.

Because there is no recipe for elementary school teacher behavior and no recipe for effective pupil behavioral control to be issued to neophyte teachers, it is comforting to assert, as stated by the publication, Fifty Years of Progress in Teacher Education (1958, p. 14) that . . .

> In the vast majority of schools, nearly all the children are living together happily cooperating in friendly fashion, governed firmly yet with self-control growingly taking the place of the old, harsh, authoritarian teacher control. . . .

However, elementary school teachers should be prepared to direct pupil behavior during the term of their contracts. This is realistic because there is often problematic child behavior related to uneven psychosocial development. Behaviors not within the classroom social system tolerance limits often must be redirected or curbed.

Bullis and O'Mally (1947, p. 165) stated that:

> Teachers are confronted with many different types of classroom behavior problems in their everyday dealings with the boys and girls in their classes. A high percentage of the time, the energy and the ingenuity of most teachers are taken up with the problems of a comparatively few pupils . . .

Crow and Crow (1956) comment that it takes all the ingenuity a teacher has and all the perserverance he can muster to keep pupil control techniques acceptable to professional standards and to the individuals in a group. Pupil control of some nature appears to be inherent in the teacher's role if only because his skill in eliciting desirable pupil behavior may delineate professional success. Teachers who desire to be considered effective with children should become knowledgeable of and skillful in pupil control techniques. A main concern of modern educators is to elicit desirable behavior by the most educative and worthwhile methods. Modern educators and child development specialists do not consider the child to be born a self-disciplined personality nor does he achieve self-controlled behavior without many experiences in interacting with others.

The publication, Teacher Education: A Reappraisal (1962, p. 158) states that "Educators have placed a great emphasis on self-discipline as an educational aim. As an ultimate goal it is sound, but it is important for teachers to understand that it is a goal rather than an achievement." Crow and Crow (1956) assert that if teachers wish to

create pupil attitudes that direct appropriate behavior, teachers must help the pupil to understand why he acts as he does.

Teachers are less and less frequently trying to authoritatively force obedience but rather, they are attempting to encourage the internal development of self-directed behaviors under empathetic humanistic guidance. If, indeed, humanization of teaching-learning is a force in education for emphasizing the appropriate behavior, teachers must continue to learn how to interact with their fellows and with pupils and to understand their idiosyncrasies in relation to growth and development stages. Bruce and Holden (1957) suggest that it appears no one can tell a teacher how to understand the individual child and his life situation, or that no one can simply tell a teacher how to have empathy for or how to understand a child's emotions and behaviors. It seems that the teacher must desire to have deeper sensitivity to children's internal feelings and external behaviors. In his own interactions with individual children the teacher must desire to achieve respect for their uniqueness.

Bruce (1957) commented that the grasping of understanding and the gaining of empathy with pupils is difficult because individuals differ greatly and because a teacher is limited in interpretative ability by virtue of his own more or less limited outlook. Each person uniquely views and perceives others, and one's greatest need is to perceive himself objectively. This vital corrective, clarifying, "vision" or understanding of self is a process continually involved in understanding others well enough to interact sensitively with them. The unique "self" leads each person into his peculiar way of perceiving himself and others. Our personal experiences have caused our uniqueness and

our manner of dealing with others. Thus it is appropriate that self awareness should be sought through a personal examination of our experiences.

It seems sensible that teachers should make a continuing and a sincere endeavor to become aware of others and to know themselves. As Jersild (1955, p. 82) so aptly stated: "To help a pupil to have meaningful experiences, a teacher must know the pupil as a person. This means, as has been emphasized . . . that the teacher must strive to know himself."

In other words, a teacher must have an adequate self-concept and an acceptance of himself if he is to sensitively relate and interact with students. A teacher must help pupils know themselves to facilitate the acquisition of the healthy attitude of self-acceptance. Self-acceptance is believed to be related to the achievement of a self-concept and tc the development of internalized self-discipline. Each of these aspects appears to be inherent in pupil interaction and behavioral control within and without the classroom and the school social system.

From the introspective behavior of the teacher, modifications of the teacher's perception of children's developmental and behavioral problems may develop. Kimbrough (1968, p. 266) has stated that: "Teachers often create disciplinary problems by misunderstanding pupil behavior." Thus, to minimize the misunderstanding of pupil behavior due to intra-person perceptual-referential background, it is essential that teachers become aware of personal hostilities, desires, fears, anxieties, and related impulses so that they may more adequately fulfill teacher roles. Jersild (1955) commented that for a teacher to

develop adequacy in others, there must be some feeling of self-adequacy in the teacher himself.

Combs (1952) implies that the import of teacher sensitivity to human feelings, to adequacy, and to self-acceptance is that the behavioral problems of elementary school age pupils are, in large measure, relative to the pupil's self-concept. The psychological literature reflects the notion that the kind of self-concept an individual possesses determines, in many cases, whether he is a maladjusted or a well-adjusted individual. The development of a self-concept or identity sense is an intense striving for both the child and for the adult. This can be illustrated best by Maslow's (1954) theory of motivation which expresses a need hierarchy, relative to the physiological entity, of safety, belongingness, love, self-esteem and self-actualization in the human personality. Often, pupil behaviors can be related to such strivings within the classroom and school social systems. It appears, most often, that the individuals who see themselves as liked, as wanted, as acceptable, as worthy and as able, exhibit the fewest behavioral problems and deviations. Such people usually show a better fit within their social systems and exhibit less behavioral difficulty in interpersonal interactions.

Blackham (1967, p. 58) has stated that: "the prime pre-requisite for helping a child with a problem is an understanding of the problem in relation to that particular child . . ." Thus, sensitivity to pupils' problems, and to individuals is a distinct professional goal for teachers and for student teachers if such sensitivity really creates fewer behavioral problems and really fosters more effective learning situations.

According to Blackham (1967) it may well be that teachers who become more attuned to themselves and to their perceptions of others, may avoid warps in their thinking and behavior. Teachers may set more reasonable personal goals and appraise their achievements more realistically. Such teachers may also realize the impossibility of totally substituting for parents or they may realize their drive for academic perfectionism. Teachers may begin to see the futility of attempting to be nice to everybody all of the time in favor of more realistic reactions in personal interactions with pupils. As personal awareness comes, anxiety and guilt and defense may be replaced with security feelings which generate greater ability to understand others.

Justification for the Study

Appropriate pupil behavioral control appears to be an essential ingredient in the group situation inherent in all classrooms. Pupil control, the perception of pupil misbehavior and subsequent teacher-selected techniques of prevention or treatment, therefore appears to be an integral part of teaching behavior in the public elementary school. Teacher-pupil control typology may vary from custodial to humanistic as discussed by Willower, Eidell, and Hoy (1967, p. 4) who stated that:

> Teachers may emphasize punitive sanctions, coercion, and ridicule as well as withholding rewards to gain compliance to arbitrary standards set by the teacher or the organization. Or sensitive teachers may appeal to the individual's senses of right and wrong, his self-discipline in a non-punitive, understanding, and supportive manner to achieve behavior norms and role expectations.

If appropriate pupil control is vital to success in teaching elementary school youth, and if humane understanding and perception

leading to pupils' holding self-adequacy and a good self-concept is important, it behooves educators to determine if secure, sensitive, perceptive teachers trained in human relations are essential. It must be determined if, indeed, they need to be prepared. Educators must also determine if opportunities for such preparation now exist in pre-service education.

This investigation was based upon the premise that perception and the resultant behavior which is rooted in beliefs and attitudes, does not change adequately through the usual teacher education program. This research is also based upon the premise that pre-service intensive human relations laboratory experiences within a comfortable, safe and a supportive atmosphere provided by the teacher education institution may provide students teachers a concentrated opportunity to explore their *own personal ideas*, their own attitudes, their own feelings toward others and allow them a greater opportunity to develop into more sensitive, more humanistic, elementary school teachers; perceptually open to the idiosyncratic needs of pupils.

The Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to determine whether exposure to intensive human relations laboratory experiences in addition to the traditional student teaching experience would allow elementary student teachers to: (1) change their perception of and their awareness of how others think, feel, and are likely to behave, and (2) acquire the knowledge of, and the ability to propose more desirable treatments for pupil misbehavior in the classroom.

Evidence in response to the following broad questions was sought:

1) Do elementary school student teachers who also participate in intensive human relations laboratory experiences differ from elementary school student teachers who participate only in the traditional student teaching program in their perception of what constitutes pupil misbehavior?

2) Were these two groups of elementary school student teachers in substantial agreement concerning proposed treatment for children who exhibit misbehavior?

3) Do student teachers' attitudes toward behavioral problems exhibited by children change significantly as a result of intensive laboratory experiences in human relations?

4) Do student teachers working in differing socio-economic status school environments differ in their level-of-seriousness perception of the behavioral problems of elementary school children as a result of intensive human relations laboratory experiences?

5) Do student teachers working in differing socio-economic status school environments differ in their proposed treatment of the behavioral problems of elementary school children as a result of intensive human relations laboratory experiences?

This experimental investigation was an attempt to analyze the consequences of intensive human relations laboratory experiences on students teachers' perceptions of behavioral problems and on their proposed treatment of elementary school children who exhibit behavioral problems.

Basic Hypotheses

This study proposed to establish a basis for testing the following null hypotheses:

Hypothesis One. Student teacher perception of the seriousness of behavioral problems which frequently constitute elementary pupil misbehavior does not differ significantly between student teachers who participate in intensive human relations laboratory experiences in addition to the traditional student teaching program and student teachers who participate only in the traditional student teaching program.

Hypothesis Two. The proposed desirable or undesirable treatment of behavioral problems of elementary school pupils does not differ significantly between those student teachers who participate in intensive human relations laboratory experiences in addition to the traditional student teaching program and those student teachers who participate only in the traditional student teaching program.

Hypothesis Three. The attitudes of student teachers toward behavioral problems as reflected by desirable or undesirable proposed treatment of the behavioral problems, do not change significantly between student teachers who participate in intensive human relations laboratory experiences and those student teachers who participate only in the traditional student teaching program.

Hypothesis Four. The perceived level-of-seriousness of behavioral problems does not differ between student teachers in lower socio-economic status school student teaching assignments, who participate in student teaching with intensive human relations laboratory experiences, and those student teachers in lower socio-economic status school

student teaching assignments, who participate only in the traditional student teaching program.

Hypothesis Five. The perceived level-of-seriousness of behavioral problems does not differ between student teachers in other socio-economic status school student teaching assignments, who participate in student teaching with intensive human relations laboratory experiences, and those student teachers in other socio-economic status school student teaching assignments, who participate only in the traditional student teaching program.

Hypothesis Six. The proposed treatment of elementary pupil behavioral problems does not differ between student teachers in lower socio-economic status school teaching assignments, who participate in student teaching with intensive human relations laboratory experiences, and those student teachers in lower socio-economic status school student teaching assignments, who participate only in the traditional student teaching program.

Hypothesis Seven. The proposed treatment of elementary pupil behavioral problems does not differ between student teachers in other socio-economic status school teaching assignments, who participate in student teaching with intensive human relations laboratory experiences, and those student teachers in other socio-economic status school student teaching assignments, who participate only in the traditional student teaching program.

Definition of Terms

For the purposes of this study, the following definitions were used:

Behavior. The conduct of elementary school children, either decorous or improper. Behavior considered appropriate or improper is relative to the standards of the school social system and to the student teacher.

Treatment. The technique or procedure proposed by student teachers to cope with perceived and adjudged behavioral problems of elementary school children. It may be adjudged desirable or undesirable.

Punishment. An unpleasant experience consequent of a certain course of behavior and meted out by the teacher in retribution or in the hope of discouraging the repetition of a behavior.

Student Teacher Perception. The behavioral response triggered by a sensory input. The input is screened by a mental set modified by individual training and experience. The behavioral response may be accepting or rejecting with respect to observed behavioral problems. It will be reflected by the rating of a behavioral problem as of high, medium or low seriousness and by the selection of a proposed behavioral problem treatment procedure.

Attitude. The positive or negative mental and emotional set of a teacher with respect to a social object or phenomenon such as a person, race, institution, or characteristic. The selection of desirable and undesirable treatments for pupil behavioral problems reflects teacher mental and emotional set.

Intensive Laboratory Experiences in Human Relations. A seminar type program in which the major methodology of learning employs the involvement of psychologically normal participants in exposing, diagnosing, examining, and critiqueing personal feelings, attitudes, and resultant behaviors in their relationships with others. Essentially,

the structural aspects of the laboratory environment are:

1) The exposing (verbally and nonverbally) of one's own ideas and feelings to other student teachers.

2) Receiving feedback (interaction with other group members).

3) The exploration of one's own beliefs, attitudes, values, and resultant behaviors.

4) The examination of teaching problems which caused student teachers to initiate behaviors to cope with the problems.

5) A supportive atmosphere without personal threat or authority.

6) Leaders offer a supportive attitude of encouragement and acceptance but do not supply "ready" answers to participants.

7) These experiences are to assist student teachers in recognizing individual differences, needs, and levels of awareness in themselves and in others. It must be recognized that the participants must be normal student teachers because the laboratory group is not a depth psychotherapy unit.

Traditional Student Teaching Experiences. Those regularly catalogued academic and professional field experiences for elementary school student teachers at Oklahoma State University while enrolled in the nine-week block courses and the nine-week supervised student teaching experience in cooperating public elementary schools during the senior academic year of the teacher preparation program. This program does not encompass a seminar in human relations.

Block Courses. Those courses enumerated in the 1968-1969 Oklahoma State University Catalogue (Teacher Education Section) related to readying the senior elementary education teacher candidates for entry into the supervised student teaching experience. Academic block

courses consist of Language Arts, Social Studies, Philosophy, Science, and other curricular courses specified in the teacher preparation course outline which emphasize academic content and teaching methods.

Lower Socio-Economic Status Schools. Those elementary schools identified by each school system administration as meeting the criteria of the Oklahoma State Department of Education and the United States Office of Education and qualifying as E.S.E.A. Title I project elementary schools. Generally, pupils come from homes in which the parents, for the most part, are included in the manual labor group in modern industrial society. These parents generally occupy the lower ranks among the classes in income, education, status, and in living standards.

Other Socio-Economic Status Schools. Those elementary schools which do not qualify as E.S.E.A. Title I project schools and whose pupils come from homes in which parents, for the most part, are middle class white-collar or professional workers and who emphasize higher aspirations for education, living standards, family living, mores and recreation in life. These elementary schools were identified by each school system administration as not qualifying for Title I designation.

Experimental Group. A group of student teachers designated to participate in the intensive human relations laboratory experiences, in addition to the regular student teaching program.

Control Group. A group of student teachers designated to participate only in the traditional student teaching program.

Major Assumptions

For the purposes of this study the following assumptions were

posited:

1) That in view of desirable procedures for working with children, student teachers should have a repertoire of acceptable and appropriate alternative teacher behaviors for dealing with pupil behavioral problems regardless of the socio-economic levels of pupils, the pupil's past history or the nature of the pupil's misbehavior problems.

2) That student teacher candidates had been exposed to essentially similar academic, methodological and philosophical backgrounds of preparation by virtue of Oklahoma's state accreditation regulations, and Oklahoma State University teacher training requirements.

3) That student teacher candidates exhibited similar intrinsic desire for instructional competence because they had done voluntary school observations and worked in schools, passed rigid admissions screening and rigid academic testing, passed speech competency tests and maintained grade point requirements and voluntarily enrolled for student teaching experiences and block courses.

4) That student teachers possessed respect and regard for the worth and essential integrity of all children and for themselves.

5) That student teachers were afforded opportunity to practice pupil control on their own during the student teaching experience.

6) That subjects would respond to the instrumentation willingly and without feeling appreciable personal threat.

7) That a major goal of the public elementary schools is for each individual to learn self-discipline to the extent that he would be able to interact appropriately with others in his environment.

8) That all human beings have the same basic emotional need for love, success, belonging, security, adventure, and contribution.

9) That human relations sensitivity could be learned only by personal involvement and not by communication alone.

10) That intense human relations experiences would actively involve the student teacher in specific problems related to pupil instruction and behavior.

11) That intense human relations laboratory experiences would allow the student teacher to become aware of himself and his own attitudes as they involve perception and decision making concerning pupil behavioral problems.

Limitations

This study was limited by the inherent weaknesses of the instrumentation. Inventory type instruments do not require subjects to perform at their maximum levels and a subject may give false or dishonest responses if he feels coerced or wishes to make a desired impression or if he lacks sufficient insight to make objective responses concerning his behavior.

A limitation existed because of the difficulty in standardizing identical intensive human relations laboratory experiences for each small group. However, essentially identical procedures were structured and executed with each group.

The response data may not be inferred to a population other than that of student teaching candidates at Oklahoma State University because generalization is appropriate only when made to popularions significantly similar to the population employed in this study.

This study was limited because the sample subjects represented only females; thus, inference may not be made to male student teachers.

All conclusions or inferences drawn are approximate as are all inferences based on empirical data which are, by their very nature, characterized by some degree of unreliability, and are probably estimates rather than statements of inviolate relationships.

Summary and Organization of the Study

Chapter I of this study has provided background information to the study. The purpose and need for the study as well as the hypotheses to be tested have been identified. The major assumptions basic to this study as well as the limitations have been stated. Finally, the terms used frequently in this study are defined. The format for the succeeding chapters is as follows: Chapter II treats the selected, related literature which was reviewed for this study. Chapter III relates the methodology and design of the experimental nature of this study. Chapter IV presents the analysis of data collected for this study. Chapter V presents the findings and makes recommendations in relation to these conclusions for further research.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

Amid the current dynamism and development in American education one finds a relatively unresearched area in that domain of pupil discipline or pupil control as it has become known today. Although recent years have witnessed continuing interest in elementary school pupil behavioral problems and control procedures, research efforts have contributed little solid evidence toward general solutions or approaches. This is probably because of the difficulty in developing a scientific approach to the variability of human behavior patterns in diverse school and classroom social systems. It is probable that the magnitude of this aspect of education has prevented an energetic effort to apply research skills while other areas of education offered more fruitful research results. There exist, as yet, many unanswered questions in this domain.

This research is interested in whether exposure to intensive laboratory human relations experiences in conjunction with the student teaching activities allow elementary school teachers to change in their awareness of how they and others think, feel, and are likely to behave. A question of interest exists concerning whether student teachers so exposed change in their abilities to act in an educationally appropriate manner in varying interpersonal situations in the elementary school

and thus foster more desirable pupil control and teacher behavior.

This chapter includes a review of selected sources of research and expert opinion pertaining to the psychosocial developmental aspects of teacher attitudes toward pupil behavior, societal attitudes toward child disciplinary processes, the influence of social system structures on behavior, teacher training preparation developments and modern viewpoints concerning pupil problems and pupil control.

Teacher Attitudes Toward Pupil Behavior

To realize effective teaching with elementary school children, it is important for the teacher to possess basic knowledge and insight into developmental behaviors. This knowledge may be derived from vicarious experiences through research and reading as well as through observation of actual child behaviors in and out of school-type situations. This approach has been utilized in most modern teacher education institutions as the means for helping student teachers to understand child behavior patterns.

An N.E.A. research study (1956) of 10,000 classroom teachers found that pupil misbehavior made teaching effectively very difficult.

Eaton, Weathers and Phillips (1957) found that many classroom teachers had left the profession because of intolerable classroom behavior and that beginning classroom teachers had difficulty with handling the behavior of classroom groups.

Flesher (1954) found that beginning teachers in Ohio rated the maintenance of order or discipline as a primary problem and that administrators considered this problematic area to be of greatest magnitude to elementary school teachers.

Nelson and Thompson (1963) reported pupil discipline and control to be at the top of the list of teacher problems.

Arthur Jersild (1955) intimated that probably one of the major reasons why the average teacher finds it so difficult to understand children's behaviors can be ultimately traced to the lack of teacher self-understanding, through which they may be willing to accept different kinds of children and be better able to interpret perceived behaviors of individual pupils. Self understanding may enhance the development of satisfactory interrelationships between teachers and elementary pupils and assist in the development of teacher knowledge and insight into the dynamic nature of child behavior patterns in the school social system.

Bidwell (1967) also emphasized that the accepting of one's self as one really is, with one's potentials and limitations, leads to mental health which is vital because teachers fulfill a role of the parent surrogate in helping a child fulfill his needs. If a teacher is to accomplish this task, he must constantly endeavor to understand himself.

Abraham Maslow (1959) reinforced this thesis by statements that professional teachers and children alike need to have a good sense of identity. The problem of identity sense is not only of a philosophical nature concerning the intellect, but it is an intense striving. Psychological literature is replete with data about why children and other humans behave as they do. It has offered educators the insight that human behavior is understandable and forgiveable and above all changeable in large degree. Maslow has pointed to a major path toward self-improvement through self-knowledge and respect of this knowledge as

it affects others with whom teachers interact. Burton (1962, p. 257) suggested that non-cooperative behaviors and negative emotions of children must be accepted both emotionally and intellectually by teachers. He posits the statements that:

> The mental attitude of an individual probably constitutes the most important element in the atmosphere of the classroom. The disgruntled, sour, sarcastic, sharp, and bitter teacher has a general attitude of mind that is most dangerous to the shy, timid, oversensitive child. The suspicious, doubting, supercilious teacher does untold damage to the pupil whose daily life is filled with one long series of threats against his own security. The over anxious, demonstrative, worried teacher has built up an attitude of mind that commonly develops in the classroom regression tendencies in pupils, is responsible for baby ways of behaving, and halts the maturing process so essential to the mental health and growth of children. And so it is, in their effect on the personalities of each and every pupil in the classroom, those influences emanating from the teacher's attitude of mind are fraught with the greatest possibilities for good or evil.

Teachers may not be aware of divergence between their knowledge, beliefs, and their practices in the classroom as Oliver (1953) verified through research checking teacher acceptance of educational principles and subsequent practice utilization.

Kaplan (1952) reported that child behavior accounts for approximately one-half of the common teacher annoyances and that child behavior most severely distressing teachers was that which threatened the teacher's perceived role or that which violated the teacher's emotional or moral standards.

McDonnell (1963) supported Kaplan's findings by identifying four types of behavior that annoy teachers: (1) talking, (2) lack of attention, (3) tattling or disturbing others, and (4) seeking teacher attention or recognition. If teacher annoyance is to be reduced to acceptable levels, teachers should become aware that behavior patterns of elementary school age children are dynamic in nature and must be

understood as such. Bilinski (1952) in an unpublished doctoral thesis reported that through close observation of children, understanding of behavior patterns by teachers can be gained, but that above all else, behaviors of pupils are influenced by almost any environmental stimulus; thus accounting for the dynamic nature of child behavior in the school classroom group.

Del Popolo (1960) found a significant relationship existing between the teacher's personality, his opinions and attitudes toward teacher-pupil relationships and the teacher's observable behavioral traits. Authoritarian teachers tended to get significantly lower scores then did equalitarian teachers on an opinion attitude inventory concerning teacher-pupil relationships.

Attempts to differentiate teacher personalities that develop harmonious teacher-pupil relationships have been made. Leeds and Cook (1947) developed a scale for determining teacher-pupil attitudes and found teachers who had a harmonious relationship with children characterized by mutual affection and sympathetic understanding. The study indicated that the teacher most disliked by pupils was described by being of a mean disposition and those teachers well liked were characterized by being nice, kind, friendly, understanding, willing to help, fair, and able to explain clearly.

Amidon and Miller (1965) found superior teachers were less dominant in their classrooms, gave less direct criticism, gave more encouragement of pupil initiated ideas with intent of utilizing them in learning experiences and used direction-giving techniques less than did the average teacher. The superior teacher was more pupil accepting than the average teacher.

The literature reflects the idea that a teacher cannot assume the characteristics of the accepting-understanding teacher. It supports the concept that a teacher must desire and work to become that kind of personality. The Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development Yearbook (1962, p. 1) stated:

> Whatever we do in teaching depends upon what we think people are like. The goals we seek, the things we do, the judgments we make, even the experiments we are willing to try, are determined by our beliefs about the nature of man and his capabilities.

Increasing the teacher's skill in teacher-pupil interrelationships will not guarantee the solution of classroom difficulties; however, it may reduce the immediate anxieties and emotional duress that participants experience.

Conflict and Change in Attitudes Toward Discipline

As early as 360 B.C., Plato bemoaned the undisciplined nature of Athenian youth. Throughout educational history there has existed a great difference of adult opinion concerning that which constitutes discipline for misbehavior in young children. This difference of opinion apparently still exists in teachers of elementary school pupils. What constitutes misbehavior and the type of treatment which should be employed to curb or redirect it toward more reasonable ends is a major dilemma in education. Helping children in schools to acquire behavior patterns which contribute to the maintenance of progress and order in the elementary school classroom is an ongoing and a historic process. Pickens (1928) related that the difficulty of keeping discipline has existed within groups organized for school purposes for several centuries. In colonial times pupils were treated

quite severely and rigidly, with little recognition of individual differences. Many generations of United States citizens have sung the tune of its words of "Readin, Ritin, and Rithmetic, taught to the tune of the hickory stick." They have heard and used the old adage of "spare the rod and spoil the child." This is often repeated even today. Horace Mann described the discipline of his time as that of floggings daily for those who disobeyed. Meyer (1967) related that the dunce cap, the cane, the stick wielded by the birchman, the forcing of children to sit as still as wooden Indians, and other punitive penalties for school offenses were the routine of the early school classroom.

Many opinions related to discipline have their roots in early religious concepts relating to the depraved nature of man, and the concept of the sinful child. For generations in the United States, coercive disciplinary tactics were the traditional and the most widely accepted and effective way to insure and promote learning. The adult commanded and the child was to obey. The basic duty of the child was to please his elders because they knew better than the child what was good for him.

However, throughout history, attempts to broaden the concepts of discipline for children upon more rational and humanistic bases have been recorded. Educators began to realize that the traditional approach to education and necessary disciplinary control provided a poor preparation for democratic living principles. A shift to insure freedom of feeling and personal expression was essential and desirable for proper growth. Yet American culture still seems to support the notion that physical punishment is necessary for controlling misbehavior in

children.

Landis (1956, p. 491) has stated:

> Punishment is so deeply embedded in the American mores, due to Puritanic and Calvinistic religious heritage, that to suggest that it is wrong and unnecessary seems to be almost sacrilegious. To omit punishment from the child-training program is according to folk belief, to ruin the child. Yet punishment tends, at all ages, to build resentment and to encourage aggression--exactly the opposite ends sought.

The literature of psychology indicates that the use of fear and punishment is likely to lead to feelings of rebellion, pugnacity, and aggressive child reactions. This information has been misinterpreted by some to infer that an undisciplined child will not fear the consequences of a social behavior.

Crow and Crow (1965) suggests that this latter concept is an error in that all humans tend to avoid engaging in socially unacceptable acts because they are unwilling to face the aftermath of such sanctioned behavior. Glasser (1969) believes rules, regulations and sanctions, administered in the early stages of training, are probably needed; but gradually the child can be guided to think through the effects on himself and on others of the displayed attitudes and behaviors.

Maslow (1959) suggests that clinical and educational data dictate that young children need to learn the limits that their physical world places on them and on their gratifications. This means controls, delays, limits, renunciations, frustrations, tolerance and discipline, and it is only to the self-disciplined and responsible child that a teacher or parent may say, "Do as you will."

Educators have been searching for answers to pupil control problems for many years. In 1928, a monumental study in school-child discipline and pupil control was executed by E. K. Wickman who reported

misbehavior types common to elementary school children and compiled and validated lists of acts perceived by teachers to be misbehavior. He was confronted with the problem of the lack of any objective study of the behavior deviations of elementary school children. At that stage of development in educational history most textbooks on child training and discipline were written from the point of view of the author's individual judgment about desirable and undesirable behavior. Wickman (1928, p. 13) stated: "Relatively few studies are available in which the opinions of a social group have been collected on the subject."

Beginning with this viewpoint, Wickman requested the elementary school teachers participating in his study to list all kinds of behavioral problems which they had encountered during their teaching careers. By permitting teachers to make spontaneous responses, Wickman hoped they would record freely the kinds of behavior which they considered and treated as undesirable. The teachers reported 428 items which they considered to be acts of a school misbehavior and after duplications were eliminated, there remained 185 distinct undesirable behavioral items which were categorized into seven major groups with sub classifications.

These seven groups were:

1) Violations of general standards of morality and integrity. These violations included such acts as stealing, dishonesty, immorality, profanity, and smoking.

2) Transgressions against authority. Listed under this heading were disobedience, disrespect for authority, defiance, impertinence, insubordination, slowness in obeying instructions, and willful misconduct.

3) Violations of general school regulations. This list included truancy, tardiness, irregularity in attendance, and destroying materials.

4) Violations of classroom rules. In this category were included such acts as disorderliness, restlessnes, interruptions, too much social interaction, whispering, and lack of supplies.

5) Violations of school work requirements. Listed under this category were inattention, lack of interest, carelessness and laziness.

6) Difficulties with other children. In this category were listed cruelty, roughness, annoying other children, tattling, and miscellany.

7) Undesirable personality traits. In this classification were mentioned negativisms, unacceptable social manners, self-indulgences, arrogance, evasions, interference, lack of emotional control, and undesirable mental states.

Wickman's seminal study has influenced replication studies by: McClure (1929); Yourman (1932); Bain (1934); Laycock (1934); Hurlock and McDonald (1934); Snyder (1934); Ellis and Miller (1936); Young, Masten, Isabel (1938); Del Solar (1949); and Tolor, Scarpetti, and Lane (1967).

Significant modifications to Wickman's design were made by Hurlock and McDonald (1934) who studied the relationship between behavior problems and chronological age and found the greatest number of undesirable behavior traits occurred at age 14 for boys and at age 12 for girls. Boys' traits such as whispering, inattention, carelessness, failure to prepare and interrupting were significant. Girls exhibited such traits as carelessness, whispering, inattentiveness, lack of interest and day

dreaming.

Young and Masten (1938) determined the highest incident of conduct disorders to be violations of classroom work rules with boys having behavior problems about five times as frequently as girls and that school children exhibiting the former behaviors were more aggressive than the average child in their sample.

Del Solar (1949) interviewed teachers and parents to determine concern over behavior difficulties related to Wickman's findings. Del Solar found concern over submissive characteristics more prevalent than concern about child aggressiveness.

More recent studies such as that of Stouffer (1952) who repeated Wickman's study, found that teacher attitudes and knowledge concerning the individual child's personality and emotional adjustments had changed. This supported Stendler's (1949) findings that teachers, for the most part, recognized and advocated constructive measures for dealing with the problem prone child.

Schrupp and Gjerde (1953) indicated that teacher attitudes and knowledge concerning the individual child's personality and emotional adjustment had changed toward the viewpoint recognized as that held more by mental hygienists and guidance counselors.

Tolor, Scarpetti, and Lane (1967) found that elementary school teachers in general tend to evaluate behavior that may be described as regressive, aggressive, and emotional quite differently than do clinical psychologists. It was evident that elementary school teachers considered these types of behaviors to be more pathological than did the mental health professionals. The inexperienced teacher, especially, was found to be less accepting or least tolerant of behavior variants

and also classed a narrower range of behavior as normal.

Assuming that there has been a change of attitude in elementary teachers as revealed by research, teachers should be able to communicate this change in attitude, concerning pupil welfare, to children through their behavior. Teacher behavior should be based upon a sound pupil control ideology and a sound philosophy of behavior expectation. The areas of pupil control, discipline and philosophy of behavior expectations should be examined by elementary school teachers and a commitment developed. A sound pupil control ideology and philosophy cannot be underestimated in relationship to the welfare of both the child and the school itself as emphasized by Garber (1956, p. 79) as he stated:

> The attitudes of schools and teachers toward the disciplining of pupils have come in for critical examination and evaluation recently as the result of two separate but closely related factors: (1) the current attacks on public schools, and (2) the highly publicized examples of juvenile delinquency.

Vincent (1964) implied that the most difficult job in school is the routine preservation of order which is more than just meeting extreme situations. In virtually every school there are the "cute" and "belligerent" students who disrupt the teaching-learning process. Teachers in the classroom must handle the misbehavior problems of these students each day. Vincent implied that teachers should have the disciplinary power and right to do whatever is necessary, even use corporal punishment, to keep order in their classrooms.

Modern, child-centered elementary education theorists, teachers, and child psychologists reject corporal punishment as a means toward pupil control. Even those few who commend it, specify it as a last resort, for corporal punishment is based upon fear psychology and is

often administered in an anger state when limits have been over-reached. Child-centered educators believe, if ever acceptable, it should be employed only with those individuals which schools class as "unmanageable" or "unruly." As one of several alternatives for treating misbehavior, Hawk (1963, p. 37) stated:

> Punishment following an undesirable behavior pattern may inhibit that behavior temporarily but will not eliminate it from the child's repertoire as quickly as permitting the behavior to be produced repeatedly in the absence of reinforcement.

Some educators defend physical punishment if rewards are also offered. Morril (1957, p. 420) asserted that: "Punishment and rewarding is an honorable teaching method. Punishment gives pain to help a child remember. Rewarding gives pleasure to help a child remember."

In argument to this procedure, Brown (1963, p. 23) stated that: "A punishment is worthless, or nearly so if the offender feels no regret, sorrow, or penitence for his offense." He offers the notion that the resentment following punishment has for the offender a greater possibility of doing harm than the punishment has of doing any good.

Blackham (1967) offers support of this notion in citing that a pupil must have access to and the ability to exercise acceptable alternative behavior if punishment is to be at all effective.

Otto (1949) views discipline used in the broad modern sense, as a positive, constructive force, apart from punishment, which emerges as pupils and teachers develop, discover, and learn ways of working together effectively. Essentially, discipline should be an educational affair.

From the standpoint of a group, discipline means mutually satisfying human relations, for unless interpersonal and intergroup relations

are wholesome, there cannot exist that degree and kind of orderliness conducive to effective school work. Basically, discipline in the most commonly used sense arises out of, or is concerned with, the problem of creating and maintaining desirable interpersonal and intergroup relations.

It follows that the individual approach identifies the need for the acquisition of values and habits of self-restraint and self-control by every child. Without the acquisition of these values and habits, the individual is poorly equipped for satisfying relations with others. Discipline, then, from the individual's standpoint, is incorporated within the purposes of education.

Addicott (1958) indicates that the idea of keeping discipline has slowly given way to the idea of developing self-discipline in children and that self-discipline is a concept embodying the notion that children should be taught by experience to reason and decide what is right and what is acceptable behavior which can be defended according to acceptable social system standards. This concept is in keeping with our society of free people with rights to challenge what is not liked through proper channels. More attention has been given to the individual learning to participate in group interaction, cooperativeness, and creativity toward solving problems. Teachers are still expected to make some judgments as to what is good and what is bad even though these judgments may be relative to their age, training, and cultural backgrounds. It is still evident that some teachers believe that learning takes place when a classroom is still and quiet. Therefore, according to this viewpoint, good behavior is quiet behavior. Still others believe compliance with teacher requests and demands is good

pupil behavior. It is often quiet or compliant surface behavior exhibited by an individual which determines whether he is good or bad--whether his behavior is appropriate or inappropriate.

Some teachers base judgmental evaluation of behavior upon the relationship between pupil actions and teacher purposes, desires, and values. Some factors for judgmental bases of pupil behavior may be: (1) the child's success or failure in mastering the content and skills prescribed as learning tasks for a particular grade level, (2) the number of problems met in controlling a child's behavior so that it is in accord with the local school code and the teacher's personal conception of "good and bad," (3) the standing of the child's family in the community and its relation to the social status of the teacher, and (4) the attractiveness and sympathy winning power of the child (or his repulsiveness) in terms of the individual teacher's background of experience, personal needs and values.

However, there are many teachers who will view good behavior as that which is evidenced by children who are eager to learn, who question and discuss and who are not easily distracted. It is these children who can, within the limits of their developmental stages, decide for themselves, both individually and as a group, how they will work and what group standards of behavior will limit them. Good or appropriate behavior from this viewpoint means that the cohesive class group of individuals learn to take some measure of responsibility for their own behavior and do not require or need policing. These pupils need only teacher guidance and encouragement.

In support of this concept of behavior development in the classroom, Trow, Zander, Morse, and Jenkins (1950) theorized that the

conduct and beliefs of pupils are regulated to a large extent by the small cohesive groups within the classroom, and that these groups demand that members conform to certain group standards. Symonds (1951) has noted that little application of such group dynamics theory to teacher training or to specific classroom situations has occurred.

Passow and Mackenzie (1952) have commented that some of the classroom discipline problems and resistance of classroom groups to change could stem from teachers' lack of understanding of the individual within the group and a misunderstanding of group processes in the classroom.

The 59th Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education (1960) emphasized the importance of understanding the sociological and psychological aspects of the human group and the individual in the classroom and the important relationship of these aspects to the teaching process.

Kvaraceus (1960) suggested that good discipline would result only when classroom interrelationships among students and teachers were such that the highest development of all was assured. This notion was also supported by Henry J. Otto (1949, p. 300) who stated:

> Whether discipline is good or poor depends upon the degree of orderliness desired and the method whereby that orderliness is secured. Is the kind of discipline sought which produces silence in the classroom so that the drop of a pin is audible? Or is the discipline preferred that permits the orderly noise and activity reflecting dynamic pupil purposes? . . . Since discipline from the group standpoint means that degree of orderliness which permits effective school work, anything which interferes with that makes for poor discipline and anything which promotes it makes for good discipline. . . . That statement, trite but sound, needs explanation in order that it may be understood properly. "Good" and "poor" need to be defined when they are applied to discipline. Wholesome (socially approved) working relationships prevail when there are no conflicts which cannot be resolved by peaceful means

> without unfair injury or advantage to either party. Conflicts which cannot be thus resolved may be between two individuals, between an individual and a group, or between two groups.

In summary, the task of securing good pupil control is an educational one. The kind of discipline desired is the kind that comes from within the child and is rooted in attitudes, understandings, skills, and habits which make possible socially accepted modes of interpersonal and intergroup relations. Although there has been wide variation in the interpretation of what constitutes adequate pupil control or discipline in the classroom and how to attain it, there seems to be near uniformity of opinion that unless teachers and pupils exist and work together in harmony toward desirable ends, little of value can be accomplished by their efforts. Teachers and pupils working cooperatively together is in the democratic spirit and may indicate harmonious interrelations and self-discipline.

There seems to be a choice between orderliness produced by autocratic domination and punishment, and the good conduct resulting from pupil understanding and self-discipline. Since the perception of misbehavior is relative to the perceiver and to his particular social systems, it is extremely difficult to distinguish between minor and major deviation in behavioral conduct or even between acceptable behavior and misbehavior. In one social system, some behavioral acts may be viewed as trivial and in another as the serious distortions of delinquency.

Thus, the unresolved question, when does an act performed by a student become a behavioral problem?

Wickman (1928, p. 3) stated:

> It is noted that the very existence of a behavior problem is designated by personal or social attitude. There can be no problems in behavior, in the active social sense, unless someone reacts to them as such. Moreover, any form of conduct in a child or adult may become a problem if it is regarded and treated as undesirable behavior by the social group in which the individual happens to live.

Michaelis (1953, pp. 150-1) has stated that teachers must realize:

> Since unacceptable behavior is learned as well as desirable behavior, it should not be looked upon as a malady to be treated but as an effect, the cause of which needs to be explored and either removed or compensated for. Some kinds of behavior may be perfectly normal to the child's developmental level, and may demand consideration. . . . Successful control must be based on understanding and must be democratic in character.

Crow and Crow (1965) suggest that until recently, many educators regarded discipline as referring to what was done in the classroom to force the redirection of learner behavior to be in accordance with those rules and regulations as set forth by the school and/or the teacher, and rigidly enforced by way of one or another drastic overt means.

The ability of the teacher to gain overt obedience to his commands was once believed to be the evidence that a class was well disciplined.

According to Judson T. Shaplin (1962), neophyte teachers often have confused beliefs and attitudes toward authority and toward their own roles in exercising authority. Neophyte teachers have frequently displayed overt physical behavior, personal affront, excessive outburst of temper, and an extreme authoritarian stance in those situations where students actually tested the limits of allowable behavior within the classroom setting. This is a relatively negative view of discipline. In this sense, discipline becomes synonymous with punishment by an autocratic adult. The positive view emphasizes the development of constructive self-criticism with teacher guidance toward acceptance of

a social basis for cooperation within a group or social system in a manner that allows for individual uniqueness.

Socio-Economic Level and Child Behavior

Ongoing political and social change in American society has brought attention to those human beings who are referred to as the lower socio-economic and/or culturally deprived. In our fast-moving dynamic and technological world, education has become a prerequisite for success in life for millions of people. Evidence seems to be mounting to indicate that the economically and culturally deprived child seems more familiar with failure than with success.

Sochet (1964) pointed out that one of every two children in the American public schools is from the disadvantaged class. Frank Reissman (1962) has estimated that America is fast approaching a population one-third disadvantaged. These estimates are reason enough to begin to focus attention on the child of the lower socio-economic class. Emphasis in education has been stimulated by sections of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 which infused federal monies into programs of education aimed at this population segment.

The Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders (1968) indicated that recent urban housing renewal projects have been accepting newly urbanized families in the inner city areas of metropolitan complexes. These project centers have been filling with unskilled and semi-skilled workers in the industrial labor pool. This mobility and influx into the urban centers has overloaded the existing schools and the educational opportunity to qualify the lower class person for higher income producing jobs, has not been widely available.

Cooperative school and home programs for the education of children have been developed in a massive attempt to upgrade educational advantage for the lower class pupil. This upgrading attempt is based upon the assumption that environmental-cultural conditions of the home, the school and the neighborhood play a major part in the shaping of child behavior and in intellectual growth.

Hollingshead's (1945) study, Elmstown's Youth, revealed the influence of the home and the socio-economic level of the child to be determinants of appropriate or inappropriate child behavior patterns. His research suggested that the school's culture may determine the academic progress of children even more than does instruction.

Anthropologists have indicated that the cultural influences of a society are acquired by children who easily absorb those beliefs, values, attitudes, and ultimate behaviors which their societal system emphasizes. Robert Merton (1957) presented the theory that conflict results when gaps between social goals and the capacity possessed by humans for attainment of these goals exist. This theory may account for subcultures developing which foster idiosyncratic brands of acceptable behavioral patterns which may be in total conflict with those of the dominant school or larger societal group.

Against this concept, posited to exist by Merton, Havighurst and Neugarten (1957) offer the notion that the school functions as a preserver of middle-class American social values, aspirations, traditions and consequent behavioral patterns.

As a result of the increase in population mobility, greater urbanization, more rapid and accessible communications, newer legislation, and greater industrialization in America, there seems to be increasing

interaction between people in differing socio-economic groups. Current literature has also brought public exposure of the child in lower socio-economic levels and described his environment as well as his patterns of behavior which are often considered antisocial by many people.

Barron (1959) saw antisocial behavior as reflecting the inherent delinquency of a culture. That there is a discrepancy between observers is emphasized in the explanations of antisocial behavior in lower socio-economic and disadvantaged children by Willie (1964, p. 176) who stated: "The most popular theoretical explanation of social and delinquent conduct of a juvenile person is that of cultural deprivation."

The Educational Policies Commission (1962) suggests that there is growing evidence that those people who have modes of living different from the society-at-large, either by situation or by choice, are involved in the cultural fermentation. Many are unwilling or unable to accomplish the transition to the ways of traditional living and these persons may be disadvantaged by their cultural mode. Many studies of disadvantaged children have indicated that they generally possess peculiar characteristics which set them apart from other children. Educators should recognize that these children may be socialized in ways quite different from children of the middle class. Teachers must acknowledge the differing value patterns, beliefs and attitudes which children from other than the middle class bring to the school and classroom social system. Olsen (1965, p. 80) offered the notion that to be effective, the school must admit reality as he stated succinctly:

> I suggest that the central challenge that the slum child presents to the school is not the only disadvantages that he brings with him. His challenge to us is much more profound than this. His ambitions, his hopes, his desires, his

> attitudes toward authority, education, success, and school, his fears, his habits, his hates . . . in short, his basic orientations toward life . . . are, in many ways, so different from ours that we do not understand him nor does he understand us.
>
> In other words, the child born and raised in a lower class cultural milieu derives his basic perceptions and values from that milieu. He comes to school with a culture . . . that is, a way of perceiving and behaving . . . that is distinctly different from the school culture. The school is a middle-class institution not only in its attitudes and value orientations, but also in its controls and rewards, its teaching materials, its personnel, and in its administrative practices.

Olsen (1965) suggests that for the teacher in the lower socio-economic school, probably the major difficulty is keeping discipline. Teachers who succeed learn to set up strict routines immediately and present a clear, strong authority figure while maintaining discipline in a climate of informality.

Martin Deutch's (1960) study estimated that as much as 80% of a teacher's school day was spent in trying to maintain order; even the best teachers spent 50%.

Hayes (1964) pointed out that a widely recognized characteristic of the disadvantaged child is hostility toward school and a general apathy for educational tasks. Teachers often see an indifference to personal responsibility and great amounts of non-purposeful activity which may become unacceptable behavior.

Greenberg, Greever, Chall, and Davidson (1965) spelled out characteristics of the lower class child as opposed to his middle-class peers. First, his basic psychological responses of anger and sex are expressed outwardly and immediately. Overt fighting is a mode of living and even survival. Second, the lower class child is acculturated very quickly partly because he is on his own early in life and partly because he experiences the realities of crime, poverty, hunger,

and the like in his environment. Third, the culturally deprived child has a different idea of the social advancement which is so vital for him in the school setting. Fourth, the deprived child has a time orientation emphasizing the immediate rather than that future orientation of the school. Fifth, the attitudes of the deprived and the middle class pupil towards authority figures are dissimilar. The deprived recognize more reasily a strong physically aggressive male leader, while the middle class pupil recognizes rational and intellectual leadership.

Because of the insecurity of the family and the lack of participation of the culturally deprived child in broad societal activities, he has a change of remaining underprivileged for life. Ausubel (1963, p. 459) wrote:

> The possibility of arresting and reversing the course of behavior retardation in the culturally deprived pupil depends largely on providing him with an optimal learning environment as early as possible in the course of his educational career.

Eels (1951) cautioned that the culturally deprived child should not be equated with the slow learning pupil. His research indicated a spectrum of abilities to exist in the deprived socio-economic class which ranges from very low to the intellectually gifted.

Of increasing concern in understanding the plight of the child is the fact that it is vital for teachers and other educators not to stereotype the lower class child in relation to middle class educational standards.

Olsen (1965) pointed out a common stereotype is that the lower-class child is deficient in language skills and abilities, that he does not talk much and discuss topics and events in the classroom as

much as pupils from other socio-economic levels. This stereotype is confused when one observes the creativity and verbal language used in the daily solution of out-of-school problems in the environment of the lower socio-economic pupil.

How is the concern of educators over the plight of the lower class child manifested? The primary focus has been upon the necessity for change in the imposed middle-class value system or in the acceptance of value bases other than middle-class. Heald (1964) suggested that caution must be exercised before judgment of existing value bases is made. The careful examination and weighing must be done carefully by responsible, intelligent teachers in order to insure rational action. To denounce easily the middle-class value system as inappropriate would be hasty.

Passow (1963) indicates that schools and teachers must serve as the socialization agents for all pupils in a society to insure personal growth and democratic membership in a rapidly changing nation. Teachers must fully understand the disadvantaged child--and such understanding is a rarity. A possible cause for lack of understanding is revealed when one observes the middle-class nature of teachers. Middle-class values espouse the future, the value of work, aspiration, ambition, self-control of overt action, and personal cleanliness. These middle-class teachers deal daily with a school population consisting of over one-fourth lower-class pupils. Thus difficulties in educational processes are imminent.

McCandless (1961, p. 485) stated:

> Major difficulties in values result in serious communication difficulties between middle-class and lower-class people; these are particularly troubling to the relations between teacher and lower-class children. Because of their failure

> to understand each other's behavior, standards, and goals, mutual distrust . . . even hostility . . . may result.

Since the possibility exists that the middle-class heritage of teachers may hamper their work with children of other value-societal levels, it is imperative that teachers recognize how social classes differ in preferences and in living.

McCandless (1961, p. 451) stated:

> Not only do social classes differ in preferences for beverages, food, clothing, and manner of speaking, they also differ in values, religion, intellectual interests, and social belief. These differences are exceedingly likely to lead to breakdowns in inter-class communications; members of one class almost literally do not understand what members of another class are talking about, what they are striving for or why their goals are important to them.

It has been observed by some authors that today's teachers face an impossibility in teaching the lower-class child effectively. Shaw (1963) listed the number one problem facing urban teachers to be that of offering the culturally deprived class an education that meets its needs.

It has been emphasized that these needs and the awareness of needs are changing in the dynamic world. The Educational Policies Commission publication, Education and the Disadvantaged American (1962), has pointed to the societal change in America. Indeed, the United States societal structure is remaking itself.

Passow (1963) has indicated how change in society has affected the child. He proposed that the child is a reflection of his environment and that he must be understood in terms of its conditions and premises.

A vital education for lower-class pupils is a serious concern of all educators and of every citizen. If it is to become a reality then an appreciation for, and a respect of, the individual can help to

bridge the gap between teachers and pupils in this socio-economic class level.

Sewell and Haller (1956) promoted the idea that teachers must strive to know culturally deprived and different children and their families better and develop a more realistic understanding of their peculiar needs and standards of life.

Hernandez (1963) argued that teachers should avoid using or viewing socio-economic class as a fixed determinant in American education. Such rigidity tends to lead to the syllogistic conclusion that all individuals of a class hold identical values and that there is little room for deviation.

In summary, all the individuals comprising a race, a socio-economic status, or a culture, should not be considered or treated according to some stereotypic generalization. In consideration of the myriad factors related to social structure and its implications for human beings who live within it, it is significant for teachers and parents to begin to view total behavior in terms of those factors causing its arousal. Behavior may be viewed in terms of societal systems and it may deviate markedly among social systems.

A Changing Teacher Education

One may conjecture that sensitivity to immediate human feeling and human understanding has not been a part of elementary teacher preparation because the majority of educational psychology of human growth and development courses taught in teacher education institutions, in the past, have been primarily from a historical frame of reference. The Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (1962) has

inferred that behavior development has been tied to the individual influences and outside forces existent only in an individual's past. This philosophy discourages student teachers from considering the possibilities for individualistic change. Such a philosophy of child development is pessimistic and leaves little room or encouragement for teacher developmental efforts. Educators have insisted that teachers know about their pupils' backgrounds and their families but have focused little emphasis upon being sensitive to the child. Teacher education is becoming concerned not only with this historic behavioral-development reference but with the immediate reference, established by teacher sensitivity and appropriate interaction. It is becoming concerned with developing elementary teachers who are sensitive to how children feel and sensitive to the reasons for pupil behavior and who can interpret the child's immediate status. As has been stated, to accomplish the development of sensitive teachers, it is important that student teachers become conscious of their own psychological needs and their own ways of satisfying them without exploiting students. It is not the usual nature, it appears, of present academic disciplines to develop this sensitivity to human needs and feelings.

There is a considerable volume of research concerning the relevancy of teacher preparation and its ultimate impact upon elementary pupils. However, Seymour Metzner (1968, p. 106) wrote in the Phi Delta Kappan:

> The plain fact is that there is not a single study that, after equating for pupil intelligence and socio-economic status, has found the length of teacher preparation variable to be even peripherally related to pupil gain, let alone being of major importance in this educational outcome.

Recent research by Watts (1964) and Washburne and Heil (1960) has supported the fact that there is little or no correlation between teacher academic knowledge and pupil achievement in the elementary school subject areas. Such research is indicative of the weak relationship between teacher academic preparation and subsequent pupil achievement. Auerback (1959) and Hoyt (1966) also support this notion. Similarly, Ryans (1951) contends that the extent or length of teacher preparation does not affect the teacher's success.

Teacher pre-service education today is generally considered more complete than that of a decade or so ago as evidenced by the increased number of teachers holding college degrees and by the upgraded teacher certification requirements in most states. William B. Ragan (1961, p. 482) supported the conclusion that the elementary school teacher of today is better prepared than was his counterpart of a decade or so ago, as he stated:

> The amount and kind of preparation required for elementary school teachers has been changing rapidly in recent decades. The length of college preparation required for the elementary teaching certificate has increased . . . from two years to a full four years.
>
> The student seeking admission to a teacher education program . . . must present satisfactory grades and . . . maintain an even higher scholastic average. Instead of spending a great deal of time on professional education courses during her first two years in college, as students in normal schools did, she spends her first two years in a program of liberal education and continues this preparation along with courses in professional education during the remaining two years. The program of general or liberal education provides the elementary school teacher with a cultural background that gives her status in the community and enables her to teach the many subjects that are a part of the elementary school curriculum.

Teacher preparation has, within past decades, been responsible for many highly professional and cosmopolitan certified elementary school teachers. Many of these teachers appear to have broader experiences

than teachers of a decade ago, in that they have observed societal life and history via television, films, and through travel. They have studied greater portions of this earth and recently they have observed earth's outer space and men exploring the moon. Elementary school teachers have certainly been exposed to newer technologies, to new data, to new machinery, to varied experiences with international peoples and thus to ways of living totally different from those of several decades ago. As the Association for Student Teaching 42nd Year Book (1963, pp. 166-7) has stated:

> . . . one cannot be certain, but only hope, that today's elementary teachers have a real grasp of the pivotal position which the school holds in a democracy. However, it is clearly urgent that the teacher must put the quality of service performed for society above any personal gain which comes as compensation for the rendered service. . . .

Because of teacher accreditation requirements today, college degrees for teaching in the elementary school are based upon relatively balanced course work covering the educational foundations, educational methodology, and the academic disciplines. Teacher preparation includes experiences in child observation and in instructional experiences within the public school or laboratory school setting.

T. M. Stinnett (1965) has related that in a period of a decade or so, the teaching staff of the elementary school has changed from the predominant posture of a group whose members were normal school graduates, with little academic preparation and a bag of tricks, toward becoming predominantly a group whose members have a broad education and a high level of competence. They have been educated in a different economic and social period. New teachers are better educated, more competent, generally confident, relatively sophisticated, and aggressive.

It may be reasoned that the elementary school teachers recently prepared by teacher education programs are well prepared instructionally, professionally, and that they possess desirable social perceptions. The Association for Student Teaching 42nd Yearbook (1963, p. 165) stated:

> . . . The teacher for today's schools has deep insight into social issues and into profound psychological and philosophical problems. Such understanding is a far cry from that of the literate dame in the community a few decades ago who was willing to teach while maintaining a household . . . the teacher for today's school knows how children become enculturated and how the school may translate scientific understandings of this process into classroom procedures.

As pointed out by the Association for Student Teaching 42nd Yearbook (1963), the intensity, the complexity, the depths of problems, and the pressures reckoned with by the elementary school, by teachers and by elementary school pupils, have become more evident and crystallized. The modern teacher confronts a world in which each year serves not to reinforce but to disorient the child's behavior. Thus children are not more predictable, but less.

It has been reasoned that today's recently trained elementary school teachers are more universally prepared. Their experiences and training should afford them great objectivity in assuming educational responsibility and developing democracy for the primary objective of schools--the child. Objectivity implies knowledge and in this sense Erich Fromm (1947) suggested that objectivity does not mean personal detachment, but it does mean respect. It is the ability to avoid distorting or falsifying things, persons or oneself. Objectivity requires seeing the object as it is and seeing the self in relation to the situation in which one exists and labors. Self awareness becomes a dynamic concept rather than a static intellectual appraisal.

Objectivity, not intellectual detachment, is desirable in teacher personalities. Merle L. Bowerman (1956, p. 228) stated that:

> Teachers must be prepared with integrity of personality, a broad grasp of intellectual disciplines, great human sensitivity, and a keen understanding of a complex social system and of students who face acute problems.

In this same vein, Merle M. Ohlsen (1955, p. 226) stated that:

> The ability to communicate with others involves social skills as well as mental ability. To communicate effectively with pupils, parents and colleagues, the teacher must be able to detect how they feel, be skilled in helping them express and clarify ideas which they have difficulty in presenting, and be able to communicate his ideas and feelings to them.

Thus, the social skills may well become the dominant core of future teacher education programs.

It was in this context also that Symonds (1956) implied that the teacher's obligation is to lead, to direct, to influence, and to persuade along desirable channels without being domineering or authoritarian.

Teacher education institutions have been exhorted to prepare teachers for urban and slum school requirements. Schueler (1967, p. 94) stated:

> Classroom problems of the slum schools are of concern to us because they have largely been teacher inspired and not pupil inspired. They have arisen because the teacher was not skilled in recognizing the motivations behind the behavior and was not skilled enough to handle the behavioral problems.

Schueler (1967) has called for teacher institutions to prepare teachers to "understand the territory" of those situations and persons with which teachers interact in schools.

Del Popolo (1965) insists that there has been an emergent recognition on the part of educators that the personality of a teacher and his understanding of children are of paramount importance in teacher

education. The personalities of great teachers have always been recognized in that they attract and inspire young people. Teaching may be a function of personality. Del Popolo (1965, pp. 54-55) stated:

> If teaching is primarily a function of the teacher's personality then emphasis should be placed on the direction and modification of personality trends during the period of teacher preparation and later during actual teaching service.

Kearney and Rocchio (1956) have conducted research to determine whether the types of teacher education institutions attended by elementary school teachers were significantly related to their ability to maintain harmonious relations with children. Although the results were not definitive, they emphasize strongly that teacher education involve not only methodology and academic content but involve also psychological and philosophical principles.

Symonds (1946) also suggests that academic content and methodology in teacher education does not alter the teacher's expressions toward life situations. Academic content may superficially influence teaching but it does not determine the nature of the relations of a teacher to his pupils or his attitude toward teaching in general.

Jenkins (1951, p. 144) asserts that teacher training institutions must teach methods in group processes, and that teacher training institutions have two major responsibilities which he stated:

> (1) to clarify, through the development of theory and research, the group processes which are going on in the classroom, and (2) to help the teacher who is being sent out to the classrooms in our schools to recognize these processes as they occur in the classroom so that he may be better able to contribute to the on-going learning situation. These two jobs will keep us busy for a long time to come.

Research goes on searching for the personality factors vital to teaching. There is little evidence that an adequate teaching personality can be acquired through the usual formal course in teacher

education. Despite this lack of evidence, teacher training institutions can emphasize the development of personality because classrooms need teachers with wholesome, well adjusted personality traits.

Teacher education institutions may well instigate greater opportunities for selection, observation, evaluation, and development of students who are candidates for teacher education. Screening inventories assessing personality facets and attitudes toward pupil-teacher relations and child behavior might be used in the selection of candidates for teacher education and can act as one criterion of judgment. Such a selection process could be important to classrooms everywhere.

Thompson (1952, p. 529) supported this contention as he stated:

> Although there are many different sources of social influence within the classroom, the teacher's behavior tends to establish the key note of this "social climate." His psychological needs, attitudes, prejudices, conflicts, and personal-social values are translated into behavior patterns which become potent influences on his pupils' social growth.

This review of literature has suggested that a teacher's success in working with children depends upon his ability to gain insight into and an acceptance of his own emotions and behavior. Courses in psychology and education should therefore center on the understanding of the emotions and behavior of the students. The atmosphere of classes should be such that prospective teachers are encouraged to talk about their own problems, preoccupations, and anxieties so that they may obtain greater understanding and acceptance of themselves.

Since the student teacher's pre-service experiences influence greatly his professional attitude and approach toward children, educational institutions must emphasize the importance of maintaining a learning atmosphere characterized by understanding, openness, warmth, security, and mutual respect. In such a learning environment, pupil

needs, capabilities, limitations, and desires are important and new foci for such goal direction must be attached to education courses and to the student teaching experience.

Teacher institutions have the charge to prepare beginning teachers to adequately cope with the disturbing influences in the school; and to create public awareness of the need for creating elementary schools which would develop and foster wholesome personalities in children and teachers alike.

Ashley Montagu (1964, p. 167) asserted the need for sensitivity in teachers and for developing this aspect of human nature through educational institutions as he stated:

> All reality is relationship, and all relationships are enlarged and enriched in proportion to the sensitivity with which they are lived. Indeed, to be sensitive is to be alive; and the more sensitive one is to the world in which he lives, every aspect of it, the more alive one is. Excess of sensitivity is, of course, to be avoided, as is excess in anything. Excess of sensitivity is a pathological state and does not arise from the education of one's sensibilities but from other causes which have nothing whatever to do with the healthy nourishment of those sensibilities. It is, rather, from their inadequate nourishment that the pathologies of sensitivity are likely to arise.
>
> All education should be directed toward the refinement of the individual's sensibilities in relation not alone to his fellow men everywhere but to all things whatsoever. Human beings are the most extraordinary of instruments that can be tuned to respond to the greatest variety of wave lengths of any instrument ever devised. Just as beauty is produced on a fine musical instrument by a sensitive performer, human beings can learn to receive and to respond to all those things that cannot be spoken as well as to all those things that can.
>
> No one who has failed to have his sensibilities realized to the optimum can be said to have been fulfilled as a human being. Indeed, those who have not been so fulfilled are the only truly tragically disinherited of the world. All of us, to some extent, suffer from this disinheritance; and that failure has affected ourselves, our relationships and the world. The world is in the state it is because of our massive failure not of nerve but of sensitivity to the needs of other human beings and, not least, to our own needs.

> Who shall awaken humanity to the need for sensitivity, for the strange necessity of beauty, for vulnerability, for the recognition of the sensitive precariousness of human life? Who?
>
> It is the teachers in our schools, the unacknowledged leaders of the world.

Montagu has summed up the need for change in the developmental training of teachers for youth. He has indicated a direction in which teacher education programs might expand and develop. He has challenged teachers to become the leaders of society.

Summary

Chapter II has presented a brief resume of literature and research pertaining to the related areas of this study. It is intended that the reader would be able to develop a perspective and conception of the need leading to this experimental study in teacher education.

Chapter III will present a detailed description of the research design and the execution of the study.

CHAPTER III

INVESTIGATION PROCEDURES

Experimental Design

This study utilized a randomized experimental group-control group; pre-test post-test design. (Barnes, 1964). This design required that the elementary student teacher candidates at Oklahoma State University receive a pre-test while on the campus prior to entering the student teaching experience and prior to exposure to the independent variable treatment. Upon completion of the student teaching experience, all elementary student teachers received a post-test. The selected instruments utilized for both the pre-test and the post-test were the Behavioral Problems Inventory and the Behavioral Problems Treatment Sheet. (Dobson, 1966). (See Appendices A and B).

A strategy to control for geographic and social conditions or factors which might intervene in this investigation was employed in which the two largest metropolitan public educational facilities in Oklahoma were used as cooperating school systems. The cooperating districts were the Oklahoma City and Tulsa, Oklahoma, public schools.

The eighty sample subjects were divided into two groups of forty subjects who did student teaching in one of the two metropolitan school systems. Of each group of forty subjects, twenty subjects were randomly designated for student teaching experiences in lower socio-economic level elementary schools while the other twenty subjects were

designated for assignment to student teaching in those elementary schools not of lower socio-economic level status.

Of the twenty subjects in each city who were assigned to lower socio-economic status schools and of the twenty subjects who were assigned to other socio-economic status schools, ten subjects were randomly selected from each of the two socio-economic category assignments to form an experimental group. The remainder formed a control group.

The total experimental group of forty subjects represented a combination of the twenty selected experimental subjects from each metropolitan school district. Likewise, the total control group of forty subjects was formed by combining the remaining twenty control subjects from each city who also represented equal assignments in the designated socio-economic status schools of each metropolitan school district.

In Tulsa, Oklahoma, ten elementary schools were utilized for the lower socio-economic level assignment and six elementary schools were employed for the other socio-economic student teacher assignments. Four elementary schools in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, were utilized for lower socio-economic teacher placement and assignments in the other socio-economic levels were made in seven elementary schools.

The following experimental controls were designed into this study:

1) Randomization was employed in the cases of subject selection, assignment to groups, and in the designation of the experimental and the control group.

2) Varying socio-economic conditions of pupils were represented in the pupil contact.

3) Two large Oklahoma metropolitan geographic areas were represented by the selected school systems to expose student teachers to differing social and economic situations in schools.

4) All student teachers were female.

5) All cooperating school supervisors were female.

6) All schools were Oklahoma public elementary schools.

7) All subjects were assigned to nine weeks of supervised student teaching.

8) The process of all intensive human relations laboratory experience sessions was structured identically.

9) All experimental sessions were held at the same general time period of the student teaching day and of the same length of duration for all exposures.

Timing and Analysis

This experimental research investigation began March 12, 1969 and terminated May 22, 1969 with the conclusion of the student teaching program. The experimental group treatment phase began on March 12, 1969 with the experiences of student teaching. The collection of data was completed on May 22, 1969 by the post-test. All groups were measured in relation to the dependent variable at the outset of the experiment and again at the end of the experimental period. The experimental groups were introduced to the independent variable of intensive laboratory human relations experiences and the control groups were not so exposed. The pre-test scores and the final post-test scores were compared to calculate "change scores" in order that the change in the experimental group might be compared with any change in the control group.

Population and Sample

This study involved a randomly selected sample of senior status female elementary education student teacher candidates at Oklahoma State University. These student teacher candidates were preparing for the student teaching experience and the program of the second semester of the 1968-69 academic year.

The selection of the sample population was made following the conclusion of the second semester enrollment for the 1968-69 academic term. The experimental sample was developed from the population of approximately 150 elementary student teacher candidates enrolled in the traditional block courses and in the nine-week student teaching experience. The sample consisted of eighty student teacher candidates. The student teacher sample was numbered and through the use of a table of random numbers (Arkin and Colton, 1950), randomly assigned to the socio-economic level in which they would perform student teaching duties. The school system administrators in each city, in conformance with their policies, made the actual school placements.

No attempt to control the placement of student teachers in relationship to the cooperating teacher variable, the physical classroom, or to the nature of the classroom group, was made by the investigator. The student teacher group to experience the independent variable treatment and to be designated as the experimental group was determined by the flip of a coin.

The elementary school pupil population taught by the selected elementary school student teachers were those pupils regularly enrolled in the kindergarten and grades one through six of the public elementary schools in Tulsa, Oklahoma and Oklahoma City, Oklahoma. This

population was representative of two geographic areas and of the various socio-economic levels inherent in each area.

Instrumentation

The purpose of this study was to determine whether elementary student teachers exposed to intensive human relations laboratory experiences in conjunction with the student teaching experiences differ in their perception of behavior problems and proposed treatment of children who exhibit such behavioral problems.

To fulfill the requirements of this investigation, it was necessary to measure the attitudes and proposed practices of elementary school student teachers. Two modes of inquiry were pursued for this study in collecting data concerning student teacher conceptions and treatment of elementary school pupil behavioral problems. First, the immediate reactions of participating student teachers to specific types of behavioral problems were elicited and measured in terms of perceived seriousness, using the Behavioral Problems Inventory, hereinafter called the B.P.I. Second, the participating elementary student teachers' attitudes toward behavioral problems as evidenced by the proposed treatment was determined by their elicited response on the Behavioral Treatment Response Sheet, hereinafter called the B.T.R.S.

As mentioned in the preceding chapters, many educational authorities express the thesis that the professional philosophy and behavioral ideology of teachers is, in large measure, laid upon them by the schools in which they work and the social class levels of the districts surrounding the school. The measurement of teachers' perceptions of behavior and their attitudes toward behaviors related by the proposed

treatment, may reflect the attitudes of the schools and the neighborhoods where they are employed.

Dobson's (1966) instrument was selected as an appropriate inventory to show teachers' perceptions of child behavior at the elementary school level. The data collected for this study were derived through the employment of this instrument which was utilized both as a pre-test and as a post-test. This instrument was comprised of two sections:

1) The B.P.I., listing 37 acts of behavior

2) The B.T.R.S., listing 22 treatments.

This instrument was created by Dr. Russell L. Dobson (1966). This instrument was based upon studies reported by Wickman (1929) and others who reported misbehavior types common to elementary school children and who compiled and validated lists of acts perceived by teachers as misbehavior.

Behavioral Problems Inventory

The B.P.I. was a list consisting of 37 acts of behavior which could be viewed by student teachers as forms of misbehavior. The student teachers were asked to judge the seriousness of each act by checking whether it ranked "high," "medium," or "low" in perceived seriousness. This B.P.I. was presented to all Oklahoma State University elementary student teachers as a pre-test in the seminar course numbered Education 4450, (Oklahoma State University Catalogue 1968-69), by the instructor who administered it following a set of instructions prepared by the investigator. (See Appendix C). All respondents' inventories were identified so that a post-test could be matched for each student teacher in the sample. As a technique to reduce the

tendency to intellectualize or place a behavior in a setting, the student teachers were instructed to make an immediate response in the manner prescribed by the B.P.I. By securing immediate response to each act, it was hoped that their normal response would be elicited rather than a response indicating what they thought their perception should be.

Behavioral Treatment Response Sheet

The B.T.R.S. was selected to fulfill the requirements of the second part of the investigation. The purpose of this part of the instrument of analysis was to determine how student teachers believed certain kinds of behavior problems should be handled in the school setting. This part of the instrument was to reveal the student teacher's pattern of treatment for misbehavior.

The B.T.R.S. consists of two parts: Part I lists twenty-two possible procedures for treating behavior problems of elementary school pupils. Part II is a duplication of the thirty-seven behavioral acts list of the B.P.I. Of the twenty-two treatments proposed, eleven are of the humanistic type deemed by educational authorities to be in congruence with desirable objectives of educative experience. While eleven are considered by experts as undesirable procedures and of a rather coercive and custodial nature, which are not congruent with desirable educational experiences.

The participating student teachers were asked to select from Part I the type of treatment that they would prescribe as suitable treatment for each of the behavior problems listed in Part II. By asking the student teacher to prescribe what he considered to be the best way to

handle a particular problem of behavior, it was intended that the student teacher's insight into that particular problem and into child development patterns and an ideology of behavior might be revealed. It must be noted that "treatment" is not used synonymously with the term "punishment" as was described in previous chapters.

Based upon the statements and thoughts of such well known authorities as Hymes (1955); Prescott (1957); Rogers (1939); Menninger (1942); Jersild (1960); Fromm (1956); and Combs (1959); eleven of these items were considered to be desirable, humanistic forms of treatment, and eleven as undesirable forms of treatment for elementary school child behavior problems. Instrument items numbered 1, 3, 4, 7, 10, 11, 14, 15, 16, 17, and 22 were judged to be desirable methods of treatment for behavioral problems of elementary school children. Items 2, 5, 6, 8, 9, 12, 13, 18, 19, 20, and 21 were considered to be undesirable and custodial coercing means of treating behavioral problems of elementary school children.

It is impossible to determine a dichotomy between humanistic-desirable and custodial-coercive-undesirable treatment of elementary school behavioral problems, but most psychologists, child developmentalists, and elementary education theorists agree that there are some treatment modes more desirable than others. The treatments are deemed desirable in that they fulfill positively the basic needs of the young child such as love, belonging, security, adventure, contribution, success and reduced failures.

The items that were considered desirable forms of treatment are, as stated by Dobson (1966, pp. 51-54):

1. Give pupil opportunity to make contribution to class. An example of this treatment is participating by the pupil in a "show and tell" period.
2. Teacher uses simple control. An illustration of this type of control would be used by the teacher of facial expressions or a simple gesture as a reminder to the child.
4. Parent-teacher conference. The teacher incorporates the parent's support in treatment of the child's problem. This type of conference is sometimes exploratory in nature.
7. Pupil-teacher conference. This pattern of treatment is sometimes used as nondirective counseling session to help the child discover the reasons for his misbehavior.
10. Pupil loses some privilege. An example of this treatment might be exclusion of the child from an activity he enjoys.
11. Pupil referred to special service personnel. Treatment may consist of having the child to participate in counseling sessions with the school psychologist or elementary school guidance personnel.
14. Role playing. In this type of treatment children are given roles and a situation and then allowed to develop the play in a free and spontaneous manner. Some teachers use puppets with this type of endeavor.
15. Isolate the pupil. An example of this treatment is moving the child from his group to an isolated part of the room.
16. Emphasize good qualities of child's behavior. An example of this treatment might be calling attention to the child's good sportsmanship habits on the playground.
17. Accept misbehavior as normal for child and attempt to change through positive approach. An example of this might be the treatment of cheating by putting the child into a situation in which he is successful through self-merit.
22. Assess and improve through group discussions. This type of treatment could take place through group counseling in which children feel free to explore their behavior.

The following treatments were considered to be undesirable methods of treating behavioral problems:

2. Pupil apologizes. This pattern of treatment is very often exemplified by forced apologies.
5. Teacher lowers grades. This type of treatment is exemplified by lowering academic grades as a means of punishment for misbehavior.
6. Detention after school. This pattern of treatment includes forcing the child to stay after school for an extended period of time.
8. Pupil temporarily suspended from room. An example of this treatment is forcing the child to stand in the hall outside the room.

9. Pupil temporarily suspended from school. This type of treatment is illustrated by sending the child away from school for several days.
12. Corporal punishment is used. An example of this treatment is paddling or strapping the child.
13. Send child to principal's office. An illustration of this type of treatment would be sending a child to the principal's office for an act perceived as misbehavior by the teacher.
18. Physical control of student. This type of treatment might consist of shaking the child for his misbehavior.
19. Require additional assignment. The assignment of writing a specific sentence a set number of times is an illustration of this type of treatment.
20. Some action by fellow students. An example of this might be the use of the "kangaroo" or student court.
21. Behavior called to attention of other class members. The child is ridiculed or embarrassed in front of fellow students.

To establish instrumental reliability and internal consistency, a split-half correlation was established by the investigator based upon the administration of the B.P.I. and B.T.R.S. to a sample population of seventy-six student teachers involved in the student teaching phase of teacher education at Oklahoma State University during the first semester of the 1968-1969 academic year. The procedure used to determine reliability was to obtain the standard deviation of the instruments' split-half scores using the formula:

$$s = \frac{\sum X^2}{N - 1} - \bar{X}^2$$

The investigator next obtained the standard error or measurement utilizing the formula:

$$s \text{ measure} = \sqrt{\frac{(O-E)^2}{N - 1}}$$

Finally, the reliability coefficient for the split-halves of the instrument was computed employing the formula:

$$r_{xy} = \frac{s \text{ measure} - s^2}{s^2}$$

The reliability coefficient based upon the Spearman-Brown formula was computed to be .70.

The original instrument was validated judgmentally by a knowledgeable, competent jury of professional educators who were faculty professors of education at the University of Oklahoma in Norman, Oklahoma, and judged to be consistent with the hypothese inherent and with the theory underlying the instrument. The content of the instrument was adjudged to measure the weighted combinations of information, attitudes, skills, traits, and abilities necessary for such an investigation with teachers.

The B.P.I. and the B.T.R.S. instruments of analysis comprised the instrumentation of this investigation. They were chosen for the purpose of discovering the change, if any, in student teachers' attitudes toward children's behavior in lower socio-economic and other socio-economic elementary schools and the difference, if any, in student teachers' proposed treatments of these behavioral problems.

The Independent Variable

The purpose of this study was to determine whether elementary school teachers exposed to intensive laboratory human relations experiences in conjunction with their student teaching experiences differ in the perception of behavioral problems and in their attitudes related by proposed treatments. In other words, to determine if exposure of student teachers to human relations experiences caused a significant change in either their behavior or their attitudes.

To bring about change, if any, the randomly selected elementary school student teachers were exposed to intensive human relations

experiences in a laboratory setting in conjunction with their field experiences while performing their student teaching responsibilities.

The investigator secured the permission of school authorities from both metropolitan school systems to utilize meeting rooms in the central office complexes, in which, each week the student teacher participants could meet with the university student teacher supservisors in an intensive human relations laboratory situation. The investigator engaged the forty experimental group elementary school student teachers in nine two-hour human relations experiences in small laboratory groups of ten person. To accomplish this task, the investigator enlisted the participation and cooperation of two highly qualified group leaders to assist in executing the schedule of nine laboratory session. Both leaders had records of successful public school teaching experience, personnel guidance experience, both hold the doctorate in special fields of elementary education and were mature, trained, perceptive observers of human nature. Both leaders were experienced group leaders and knowledgeable about group dynamics processes. One of the enlisted leaders was trained in the field of guidance, held the doctorate degree and taught in this field in the university. This leader was responsible for maintaining essential laboratory structure and process in all groups through critique and suggestions to the other leaders.

Each laboratory session was recorded with the approval of the individual laboratory group. The recorded session was then available for group or leader playback, critique and study. Nine times one of the group leaders, not working with a group, visited another to observe that group leader and his group in action. Through communication of this kind the essential character of the process of group leadership

was maintained by all three leaders conducting the intensive human relations laboratory sessions with the experimental group of student teachers. The laboratory groups met in small groups of ten persons with a leader for a total of eighteen hours. All laboratory sessions were conducted in small, quiet rooms, well lighted and air conditioned for group comfort. The group usually sat around a small table facing each other and the group leader. Each small group met once weekly according to the following schedule of calendar dates.

Schedule of Laboratory Sessions

March 12, 13, 17, 20, 31

April 3, 7, 10, 14, 17, 21, 24, 28

May 1, 5, 8, 12, 15

May 19, 20, 21 were used to administer the instrument and May 22 was used for make up administrations of the instrument.

Leaders remained essentially responsible to the same groups throughout the duration of the exposure to generate the security and support necessary for group interaction.

The small groupness refers to the limited number of student teacher participants which was ten per laboratory session except when illness or other circumstance prevented attendance. Regular attendance was expected as a part of the student teaching experience sponsored by the Oklahoma State University.

The small size of each group was essential to the study in that the number of student teacher participants had to be sufficiently small for each group member to know and be able to have opportunity for some reaction to other group members. Groupness was conferred by the inter-relationship between and among the peoples involved, the normality of

participants, the interdependent purpose inherent in student teaching, and the shared norms and procedures used by the functioning groups. The intensive human relations laboratory experiences emphasized that facts may be faced calmly, that people can differ vigorously, humanistically with complete safety, and that individual originality can be encouraged by those who interact, provide and receive feedback in interrelationship with fellow human beings.

All experiences were built around the assumption that if student teachers become sensitive to the content and the feelings of both themselves and others, they will be in a better position to work within groups of public school pupils in a humanistic fashion. The human relations experiences topics were drawn out of, and often created within the framework of the elementary school curriculum and program. There were spontaneous group discussions, decision making, and individual and group exploration of ideas, notions, attitudes, and prejudice growing out of student teaching experiences and teacher education backgrounds. The experiences revolved around practical applications and current problems experienced with elementary school children in the student teaching assignment.

The process was intended to create elementary school student teachers who were sensitive and more aware of the feelings of others, and capable of emphatically interacting effectively with other persons in differing, variable environments. According to Clanz and Hayes (1967, p. 117): "There may be extensive attitude changes toward the self and others as a consequence."

The opening orientation session opened with a leader explanation that was essentially as recommended by the NTL Institute (1968):

> This group will meet for many hours and will serve as a kind of a laboratory where each individual can increase his understanding of the forces which influence individual behavior and the performance of groups and organizations. The data for learning will be our own behavior, feelings, and reactions. We begin with no definite structure or organization, no agreed upon procedures, and no specified agenda. It will be up to us to fill the vacuum created by the lack of the familiar elements and to study our group as we evolve. My role will be to help the group to learn from its experience, but not to act as a traditional chairman nor to suggest how we should organize, what our procedure should be, or exactly what our agenda will include. With these few comments, I think we are ready to begin in whatever way you feel will be most helpful.

Into this ambiguous situation the student teachers then proceeded to inject themselves. Some promoted the topic for discussion, others withdrew and waited in silence until a clearer sense of direction or security was gained. The group often would attempt to get the leader to play a directive role like a group chairman. Whatever role a student teacher chose to play, he was also observing and reacting to the behavior of other members and in turn impacted on them. Such interactions were the data for learning the perceptions and reactions of individuals. The student teacher participants were encouraged and permitted to expose any personal feelings, attitudes, and behaviors in their relationships with others in the group. Others were allowed and encouraged to critique, diagnose and examine critically the behaviors of members of the group and to express within the limits of the group personal feelings and assessments.

Essentially, the leader observed the following pattern in all group experiences.

1) The student teachers exposed their ideas, concerns, and feelings to fellow students both verbally and in nonverbal forms of communication.

2) The group participants received immediate feedback during interaction with group members which was triggered by behaviors, or verbal and nonverbal communications expressed in the laboratory session.

3) The students explored beliefs, attitudes, values and resultant behaviors experienced while performing student teaching activities.

4) The student teacher participants examined teaching problems and the methods necessary to deal with the problems observed and experienced.

5) The group participants felt little personal threat within the group from members or from the leader as evidenced by high level of participation and freedom.

6) The leaders of the groups offered supportive encouragement and developed the atmosphere of acceptance. Group leaders did not supply "ready" answers to expressed dilemmas or plan remediation for members' problems. Group leaders acted to cause student teachers to recognize differences in individuals, individual needs and idiosyncrasies, and introspection of their feelings and awareness of others.

The laboratory sessions were based on the following assumptions about the nature of the learning process which distinguished the laboratory session from other traditional teacher education course work and experiences.

First, the learning responsibility was on the individual. What an individual learned depended upon his own style, readiness and the relationship he developed with other members of the group.

Second, the leader's role was only to facilitate the examination and understanding of the group's experiences. He helped participants focus on the way the group was working, the style of the individual

student teacher participation, or the issues which faced the group.

Third, the most group learning was accomplished when individuals examined their experiences together in enough detail so that a valid generalization could be drawn.

Fourth, participants were free to learn when they established authentic relationships with others and thereby increased their self esteem and reduced defensiveness. When participants could be open, honest, and direct with other persons so that they were communicating their feelings, defensiveness decreased markedly.

Fifth, the student teachers could develop new skills of working with people based on new understanding of the impact of individual behavior on others.

Upon examination of the recorded sessions, it was evident that the participation was excellent. The discussions and exposure of individual problems were dynamic and often explosive.

It is important to note that individual elementary student teacher participants recognized that different members saw the same aspect of behavior or need differently--for example as relevant or irrelevant, supportive or antagonistic, clear or ambiguous. Rarely did all the members evidence the same general perceptions of a given event experienced in student teaching.

Leaders could note evidence of group cohesion developing and norms of allowable behaviors emerging as the tapes were replayed after each small group treatment session.

Summary

Chapter III has presented the procedures utilized in the actual

conducting of the research. The experimental design was presented along with the control features, timing, and analysis details. A description of the population and the sample drawn from it was given. The school population with which the sample subjects were in contact was delimited.

A general description of the instrumentation developed by Dobson was presented. A statement of instrument reliability and validity was presented. The nature of and the conducting of the treatment variable was detailed and explained in relation to the stated objectives.

The following chapter will present the data derived from this experimental investigation and relate the analysis.

CHAPTER IV

AN ANALYSIS AND TREATMENT OF DATA

Introduction

This chapter presents the data obtained from the investigational procedures described in Chapter III. The data obtained in this experimental investigation were used for the primary purpose of testing the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis One. Student teacher perception of the seriousness of behavioral problems which frequently constitute elementary pupil misbehavior does not differ significantly between student teachers who participate in intensive human relations laboratory experiences in addition to the traditional student teaching program and student teachers who participate only in the traditional student teaching program.

Hypothesis Two. The proposed desirable or undesirable treatment of behavioral problems of elementary school pupils does not differ significantly between those student teachers who participate in intensive human relations laboratory experiences in addition to the traditional student teaching program and those student teachers who participate only in the traditional student teaching program.

Hypothesis Three. The attitudes of student teachers toward behavioral problems as reflected by desirable or undesirable proposed treatment of the behavioral problems, does not change significantly between student teachers who participate in intensive human relations

laboratory experiences and those student teachers who participate only in the traditional student teaching program.

Hypothesis Four. The perceived level-of-seriousness of behavioral problems does not differ between student teachers in lower socio-economic status school student teaching assignments, who participate in student teaching with intensive human relations laboratory experiences, and those student teachers in lower socio-economic status school student teaching assignments, who participate only in the traditional student teaching program.

Hypothesis Five. The perceived level-of-seriousness of behavioral problems does not differ between student teachers in other socio-economic status school student teaching assignments, who participate in student teaching with intensive human relations laboratory experiences, and those student teachers in other socio-economic status school student teaching assignments, who participate only in the traditional student teaching program.

Hypothesis Six. The proposed treatment of elementary pupil behavioral problems does not differ between student teachers in lower socio-economic status school teaching assignments, who participate in student teaching with intensive human relations laboratory experiences, and those student teachers in lower socio-economic status school student teaching assignments, who participate only in the traditional student teaching program.

Hypothesis Seven. The proposed treatment of elementary pupil behavioral problems does not differ between student teachers in other socio-economic status school teaching assignments, who participate in student teaching with intensive human relations laboratory experiences,

and those student teachers in other socio-economic status school student teaching assignments, who participate only in the traditional student teaching program.

The data were obtained from eighty Oklahoma State University elementary school student teachers who were assigned as follows:

1) Twenty student teachers were randomly assigned to Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, Title I elementary schools and twenty student teachers were randomly assigned to Tulsa, Oklahoma, Title I elementary schools.

2) Twenty student teachers were randomly assigned to Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, schools of other than Title I socio-economic school status, and twenty student teachers were randomly assigned to Tulsa, Oklahoma, schools of other than Title I socio-economic school status.

3) One-half or ten of those student teachers assigned to Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, Title I elementary schools and one-half or ten of those student teachers assigned to Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, schools other than Title I socio-economic status were designated by a flip of the coin to be the Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, experimental group. The remaining twenty student teachers became the Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, control group.

4) One-half or ten of those student teachers assigned to Tulsa, Oklahoma, Title I elementary schools and one-half or ten of those student teachers assigned to Tulsa, Oklahoma, schools other than Title I socio-economic status were designated by a flip of the coin to be the Tulsa, Oklahoma, experimental group. The remaining twenty student teachers became the Tulsa, Oklahoma, control group.

5) By combining the twenty experimental subjects from Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, with the twenty experimental subjects from Tulsa,

Oklahoma, and by combining the twenty control subjects from Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, with the twenty control subjects from Tulsa, Oklahoma, a total experimental group of forty subjects and a total control group of forty subjects was formed.

A total of fourteen Title I schools and thirteen schools other than Title I were the randomly selected cooperating schools of the Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, and Tulsa, Oklahoma, public schools.

The B.P.I. and the B.T.R.S. instruments were administered to the eighty investigation subjects, as a pre-test and again as a post-test, immediately following the intensive human relations laboratory experiences and the student teaching program.

The statistical techniques utilized in analyzing the data obtained by the B.P.I. and the B.P.R.S. instruments were:

1) The Wilcoxon Matched-Pairs Signed Ranks Test. Siegel (1956).
2) The Mann Whitney U Test. Siegel (1956).
3) The McNemar Test for the Significance of Changes. Siegel (1956).
4) The Fisher Exact Probability Test. Siegel (1956).
5) The Chi Square Test. Siegel (1956).

These methods of data analysis were appropriate for determining the significant difference, if any, between the experimental group and the control group as to their perception and treatment of behavioral problems of elementary school children in kindergarten through grade six.

The Behavioral Problems Inventory

The B.P.I. was administered as a pre-test and as a post-test to all elementary school student teachers in the investigation sample.

The instrument was presented with explicit instructions to mark the B.P.I. according to the perceived level-of-seriousness of each listed behavioral act. The subjects were urged to make each rating as rapidly and as spontaneously as possible and to avoid rationalization or intellectualization of the situational aspect which might be related. The intent was to secure the subjects' natural response rather than eliciting responses calculated to "please" the investigator or to respond "like a teacher ought to respond."

To present the data derived from the B.P.I., tables have been constructed for the experimental group and for the control group. The data presented in tabular form are shown for the purpose of accepting or rejecting the hypotheses basic to this experimental study. The statistical confidence level pre-selected for rejection of the hypotheses was the .05 confidence level. Obtained statistical significance levels are reported.

To determine if a statistically significant level-of-seriousness response change had occurred within either the experimental group or the control group as measured by the B.P.I., the Wilcoxon Matched Pairs Signed-Ranks Test was utilized as the statistical technique of analysis. (Siegel, 1956). This test utilizes information about the direction of the differences within pre-test and post-test score pairs, and the relative magnitude of score pair difference. This technique was chosen because the study employed two related samples and it yielded "change" or difference scores which were ranked in order of absolute magnitude.

To utilize this statistical technique, the perceived levels-of-seriousness responses on the B.P.I. by each individual subject (pre-test and post-test) were counted and categorically totaled. The

category totals were then arbitrarily weighted as follows: High level-of-seriousness = three (3) points; Medium level-of-seriousness = two (2) points; and Low level-of-seriousness = one (1) point. Each subject's (pre-test and post-test) B.P.I. weighted category totals were collapsed to a single score whose magnitude indicated a high or low perceived level-of-seriousness for all thirty-seven of the listed behavioral acts on the B.P.I. These perceived level-of-seriousness paired-totals yielded a "change" or difference score for each individual student teacher subject in the experimental group and for each subject in the control group.

Presented in Table I are the data which were tested for statistically significant change utilizing the Wilcoxon Matched-Pairs Signed-Ranks Test. The sum of the ranks with the less frequent sign yielded an obtained T value of 267 and was the smaller of the sums of the like signed ranks with N=38. If N is larger than twenty-five, the value of z as defined by Siegel (1956, p. 79) in formula form, must be computed. The formula is:

$$z = \frac{T - \frac{N(N+1)}{4}}{\sqrt{\frac{N(N+1)(2N+1)}{24}}}$$

The computed z=1.50 which, since the direction of the difference is not predicted, a two tailed region of rejection is appropriate. Siegel's (1956, p. 247) table A value for $z = \pm 1.50$ is p=.0668 (one tailed) or p=.1336 (two tailed) which was greater than the .05 confidence level and thus indicated a nonsignificant difference between the pre-test and post-test.

TABLE I

THE PERCEIVED LEVEL-OF-SERIOUSNESS WEIGHTED TOTAL SCORES FOR THE EXPERIMENTAL GROUP AS MEASURED BY THE B.P.I.

Subject	Pre-test	Post-test	Change Score d	Rank of d	Ranks of Less Frequent Sign
1	70	62	- 8	-22	
2	70	63	- 7	-17.5	
3	76	76	0		
4	78	57	-21	-35	
5	86	58	-28	-37	
6	75	61	-14	-30	
7	71	61	-10	-27	
8	70	77	+ 7	+17.5	17.5
9	81	66	-15	-31.5	
10	66	68	+ 2	+ 5	5
11	69	84	+15	+31.5	31.5
12	72	64	- 8	-22	
13	64	60	- 4	- 9.5	
14	79	72	- 7	-17.5	
15	70	74	+ 4	+ 9.5	9.5
16	75	86	+11	+29	29
17	63	71	+ 8	+22	22
18	80	70	-10	-27	
19	80	54	-26	-36	
20	77	68	- 9	-25	
21	69	77	+ 8	+22	22
22	89	89	0		
23	80	81	+ 1	+ 2.5	2.5
24	72	79	+ 7	+17.5	17.5
25	80	83	+ 3	+ 6.5	6.5
26	66	61	+ 1	+ 2.5	2.5
27	73	78	+ 5	+13	13
28	83	84	+ 1	+ 2.5	2.5
29	74	90	+16	+33	33
30	64	74	+10	+27	27
31	76	68	- 8	-22	
32	82	76	- 6	-15	
33	74	79	+ 5	+13	13
34	65	70	+ 5	+13	13
35	73	70	- 3	- 6.5	
36	81	80	- 1	- 2.5	
37	77	73	- 4	- 9.5	
38	86	55	-31	-38	
39	72	68	- 4	- 9.5	
40	87	68	-19	-34	
				N=38	T=267

Presented in Table II are the data for the control group of student teachers in the study. The data were tested for statistically significant change utilizing the Wilcoxon Matched-Pairs Signed Ranks Test.

Applying the previous formula to the data presented in Table II, a z value of -.962 was obtained. Siegel's (1956, p. 247) table A indicates a one tailed p = .1685 for the obtained z of -.962 which was rounded to -.96. Since a two tailed p was desired, p=.1685 was doubled yielding a p=.3370 which was greater than the .05 level of confidence and thus there was no significant difference of change within the control group. The statistical tests on the data presented in Tables I and II did not show a significant change in perception of behavioral problem seriousness within the experimental and the control group. It seemed logical to compare the change scores of each group to determine if a statistically significant difference existed between the experimental group and the control group. The Mann-Whitney U Test (Siegel, 1956) was selected to test whether the two independent groups represented significantly different populations. The change score data, derived from the post-test minus the pre-test scores, were signed positively or negatively; therefore, a coding procedure utilizing an additive positive thirty-two score points was employed to maintain sign uniformity.

Presented in Table III are the coded change scores for the experimental group and for the control group. The data in Table III were analyzed to test Hypothesis One. Shown in Table III are the coded change score rankings required to derive the U statistic utilized in determining the statistical probability. A U statistic of 736.5 was

TABLE II

THE PERCEIVED-LEVEL-OF-SERIOUSNESS WEIGHTED TOTAL SCORES FOR THE CONTROL GROUP AS MEASURED BY THE B.P.I.

Subject	Pre-test	Post-test	Change Score d	Rank of d	Ranks of Less Frequent Sign
1	67	55	-12	-26.5	
2	76	67	- 9	-23	
3	82	90	+ 8	+20.5	20.5
4	74	69	- 5	-14	
5	63	61	- 2	- 5.5	
6	68	72	+ 4	+11	11
7	66	58	- 8	-20.5	
8	81	55	-26	-38	
9	81	71	-10	-24	
10	73	79	+ 6	+16.5	16.5
11	79	87	+ 8	+20.5	20.5
12	72	77	+ 5	+14	14
13	66	67	+ 1	+ 2	2
14	64	62	- 2	- 5.5	
15	76	76	0		
16	71	73	+ 2	+ 5.5	5.5
17	70	100	+30	+39	39
18	74	98	+24	+37	37
19	65	64	- 1	- 2	
20	71	68	- 3	- 8.5	
21	61	54	- 7	-18	
22	74	82	+ 8	+20.5	20.5
23	77	63	-14	-29	
24	82	59	-23	-36	
25	93	88	- 5	-14	
26	83	95	+12	+26.5	26.5
27	70	74	+ 4	+11	11
28	83	81	- 2	- 5.5	
29	80	77	- 3	- 8.5	
30	70	59	-11	-25	
31	70	48	-22	-34.5	
32	66	65	- 1	- 2	
33	68	80	+12	+26.5	26.5
34	66	51	-15	-31.5	
35	66	81	+15	+31.5	31.5
36	58	40	-18	-33	
37	86	64	-22	-34.5	
38	79	83	+ 4	+11	11
39	78	84	+ 6	+16.5	16.5
40	76	64	-12	-26.5	
				N=39	T=321.5

TABLE III

SUBJECT CHANGE SCORES AND CODED CHANGE SCORES FOR THE EXPERIMENTAL AND THE CONTROL GROUP

Experimental Group		Control Group	
Coded Scores	Rank	Coded Scores	Rank
48	78	62	80
47	76.5	56	79
43	73	47	76.5
42	72	44	74.5
40	69	44	74.5
40	69	40	69
39	65.5	40	69
39	65.5	40	69
37	60.5	38	63.5
37	60.5	38	63.5
37	60.5	38	63.5
36	56.5	36	56.5
35	54	36	56.5
34	52.5	36	56.5
33	49.5	34	52.5
33	49.5	33	49.5
33	49.5	32	46
32	46	31	42.5
32	46	31	42.5
31	42.5	31	42.5
29	37	30	39.5
28	34	30	39.5
28	34	29	37
28	34	29	37
26	30	27	31.5
25	28	27	31.5
25	28	25	28
24	24.5	24	24.5
24	24.5	23	21.5
24	24.5	22	19
23	21.5	21	17
22	19	20	15.5
22	19	20	15.5
18	13.5	18	13.5
17	11.5	17	11.5
13	9	14	10
11	8	10	6.5
6	3.5	10	6.5
4	2	9	5
1	1	6	3.5
	$\Sigma R_1 = 1556.5$		$\Sigma R_2 = 1662.9$

computed, with the sum of ranks$_1$=1556.5 and the sum of ranks$_2$=1662.9; N=40 in each group.

Since ties occurred between two or more observations involving both groups, the value of U was affected. A correctional formula for such ties was used with the samples as recommended by Siegel (1956, p. 125):

$$z = \frac{U - \frac{n_1 n_2}{2}}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{n_1 n_2}{N\ (N-1)}\right)\left(\frac{N^3 - N}{12} - \Sigma T\right)}}$$

$$z = .2494$$

The value of z when corrected for the ties is a little larger than that found when the correction is not employed, thus making it more significant. Siegel's (1956, p. 247) table A gives probabilities associated with values as extreme as the observed values of z in the normal distribution. A two tailed p under H_o of z yielded by a p of $z = \pm .25$ is .8026 and statistically nonsignificant. Consequently, the investigator failed to reject Hypothesis One. There was no significant difference between the experimental group and the control group on their perceived level-of-seriousness of the behavioral problems of elementary school children as a result of the intensive human relations laboratory experience variable.

The data presented in Table IV show a rank ordering of the behavioral problems from the B.P.I. according to the perceived level-of-seriousness by the elementary student teachers in the experimental group and in the control group. The table presents both the pre-test

and the post-test weighted score rankings for each listed behavioral problem.

Both the experimental and the control groups were in substantial agreement regarding behavioral problems considered serious. The data, followed by an asterisk, show physical attack on the teacher, sex offense, no interest in classwork, unhappiness and depression, rages and temper tantrums, cruelty and bullying, willful disobedience, truancy, lying and untruthfulness, committing petty thievery, defacing school property, cheating on class assignments and/or tests, and general rudeness and inconsideration for other students, to rank between 1.5 and 14 in order of perceived level-of-seriousness for each group on both the pre-test and on the post-test. The data in Table IV show that these acts were considered to be highly serious behavioral problems by both groups of student teachers involved in the investigation.

The behavioral problems listed on the B.P.I. generally deemed of least level-of-seriousness rank were: horseplay, eating candy, etc. in school, slovenly appearance, daydreaming, acting smart, stubbornness and contrariness, tattling on others, interrupting, whispering and writing notes, and running in the hall.

A further analysis of behavioral problems was undertaken to determine if there was a statistically significant change in either group of subjects occurring between the pre-test and the post-test on any specific listed behavioral problem, in case chance changes distributed equally in both directions had balanced out the thirty-seven items and resulted in little evidence of total group change. To accomplish this analysis, the data from the B.P.I. were summarized for each listed behavioral problem for each sample subject. The pre-test responses

TABLE IV

RANK ORDERING OF STUDENT TEACHER PERCEPTION OF THE LEVEL-OF-SERIOUSNESS OF BEHAVIORAL ACTS PERFORMED BY CHILDREN IN KINDERGARTEN THROUGH GRADE SIX

Behavioral Problems	Experimental Group		Control Group	
	Pre-test Rank	Post-test Rank	Pre-test rank	Post-test rank
Running in the hall	31	30	27	28.5
General rudeness and inconsideration for other students	12.5 *	7 *	8.5 *	9 *
Cheating on class assignments and/or tests	3 *	7 *	12.5 *	11 *
Defacing school property and/or equipment	6 *	1.5 *	1 *	1.5 *
Habitual tardiness	21.5	19	23	19
Committing petty thievery	4 *	1.5 *	2 *	1.5 *
Lying, untruthfulness	10.5 *	12 *	5 *	10 *
Masturbation	26	26	19.5	21
Truancy	12.5 *	9 *	8.5 *	7 *
Swearing, using profane language	21.5	26	22	21
Smoking	14	16	16.5	15
Obscene notes, talk	15.5	17	18	16
Playing with genitalia	18.5	21.5	19.5	17.5
Disorderliness in classroom	26	20	28.5	26
Whispering, writing notes	26	34	37	35.5
Interrupting	32	28.5	30	30.5
Failure to pay attention	21.5	15	21	17.5
Carelessness, inaccuracy in work	17	18	16.5	21
Physical laziness	18.5	23	25.5	24
Willful disobedience	8.5 *	3.5 *	6 *	6 *
Cruelty, bullying	7 *	12 *	11 *	13 *
Quarrelsomeness	21.5	21.5	25.5	24
Tattling on others	28	31.5	33	32

TABLE IV (Continued)

Behavioral Problems	Experimental Group		Control Group	
	Pre-test Rank	Post-test Rank	Pre-test rank	Post-test Rank
Stubbornness, contrariness	27	24	24	28.5
Rages, temper tantrums	10.5 *	11 *	10 *	12 *
Rudeness, impudence to teachers	24	14	14	14
Shyness, timidity, withdrawing	15.5	26	15	24
Acting smart	29	28.5	28.5	27
Unhappiness, depression	1 *	10 *	7 *	4.5 *
Daydreaming	30	31.5	31	30.5
Slovenly appearance	33.5	36	32	33.5
Sissy or tomboy	35	37	34.5	35.5
No interest in classwork	5 *	5 *	12.5 *	8 *
Sex offense	2 *	7 *	4 *	4.5 *
Eating candy, etc. in school	36	35	34.5	37
"Horseplay"	33.5	33	36	33.5
Physical attack on teacher	8.5 *	3.5 *	3 *	3 *

*Rank of behavioral problems in order of perceived level-of-seriousness. Items ranked by both groups on the pre-test and on the post-test from rank one to rank fourteen show high seriousness agreement.

and the post-test responses were tallied and the direction of change, if any, was determined; for example, from a high perceived level-of-seriousness toward a low perceived level-of-seriousness and of course in the opposite direction. The trichotomous response data of high, medium, and low perceived levels-of-seriousness were in effect dichotomized so that the data could be statistically tested utilizing the McNemar Test for the Significance of Changes as described by Siegel (1956).

The procedure used in dichotomizing the data was to summarize for both the experimental and the control group, each item's direction of response change between the pre-test and the post-test. The change was either from high perceived level-of-seriousness to lower perceived level-of-seriousness, from low to higher, or no change occurred. All item response changes in the direction from high to lower were categorized as high perceived level-of-seriousness. All high responses and low responses showing no change between pre-test and post-test retained their identity. Item scores marked as medium level-of-seriousness were alternately cast high and low and in cases of uneven distribution a coin was flipped to insure randomness of assignment into the dichotomous categories. This procedure was based upon the theoretical notion, expressed by Runyon and Haber (1967), that all mid scores (medium seriousness) in this categorical arrangement actually tend to be in the nature of low-highs or high-lows continuously distributed about a true theoretical and undetermined mid-point between the polar extremes of high and low perceived level-of-seriousness.

The dichotomized data for each of the thirty-seven listed behavioral problems on the B.P.I. instrument were placed in a fourfold table

of frequencies and the McNemar Test for the significance of change was applied, as it is particularly effective when measurement is of the nominal or ordinal scale. All cases indicative of change, previously described, were tallied in the appropriate cell of a McNemar table for each item and the formula utilizing a correction for continuity was utilized.

Siegel's (1956, p. 65) McNemar formula was employed:

$$X^2 = \frac{(|A-D|-1)^2}{A + D}$$

The sampling distribution under H_o of X^2 as yielded by this formula is distributed approximately as chi-square[1] (with one degree of freedom). Siegel's (1956, p. 249) table C gave critical values of chi-square for df's from one to thirty. For the thirty-seven B.P.I. items all obtained X^2 values which were equal to or greater than the critical value of 3.84 at the .05 level of confidence were considered to imply that a "significant" effect was found in the "before" and "after" responses.

Presented in Tables V and VI are the summarized, dichotomized data as they were analyzed by the McNemar Test for Significance of Changes for each sample group. The information is categorized in these tables as it was placed in the fourfold contingency table for test. Each cell of the table is identified as to the respective contingency cell A, B, C, and D. Those behavioral problems which evidenced statistically significant change at or beyond the .05 level of confidence are identified by an asterisk.

In one instance in Table V and in four instances in Table VI the data required the use of Siegel's (1956) Binomial Test because the expected frequencies derived by the formula D = ½ (cells A + D) were

TABLE V

PRE-TEST AND POST-TEST CHANGE IN THE PERCEIVED LEVELS-OF-SERIOUSNESS OF BEHAVIORAL PROBLEMS FOR THE EXPERIMENTAL GROUP

Behavioral Problems	Cell A Changed High to Low	Cell D Changed Low to High	Cell B No Change High	Cell C No Change Low	Obtained X^2	Significance Level
Running in the hall	8	9	5	18	0.00	
General rudeness and inconsideration for other students	11	1	21	7	6.750*	.01
Cheating on class assignments and/or tests	17	1	18	4	12.50 *	.001
Defacing school property and/or equipment	17	2	18	3	10.32 *	.01
Habitual tardiness	11	2	15	12	4.92 *	.05
Committing petty thievery	10	0	26	4	8.10 *	.01
Lying, untruthfulness	11	0	24	5	.909	.50
Masturbation	15	4	6	15	5.27 *	.05
Truancy	16	1	16	7	11.53 *	.001
Swearing, using profane language	13	4	13	10	3.17	.10
Smoking	17	1	14	8	12.50 *	.001
Obscene notes, talk	14	2	16	8	7.56 *	.01
Playing with genitalia	16	0	8	16	14.06 *	.001
Disorderliness in classroom	7	9	13	11	.63	.80
Whispering, writing notes	7	13	2	18	1.25	.30
Interrupting	5	15	8	12	4.05 *	.05
Failure to pay attention	7	6	19	8	11.07 *	.001
Carelessness, inaccuracy in work	10	7	15	8	.235	.70
Physical laziness	15	6	9	10	3.047	.10
Willful disobedience	13	0	20	7	11.07 *	.001
Cruelty, bullying	14	1	20	5	9.60 *	.01
Quarrelsomeness	9	2	17	12	3.27	.10

TABLE V (Continued)

Behavioral Problems	Cell A Changed High to Low	Cell D Changed Low to High	Cell B No Change High	Cell C No Change Low	Obtained X^2	Significance Level
Tattling on others	10	10	11	9	0.00	
Stubbornness, contrariness	7	9	12	12	.0625	.90
Rages, temper tantrums	12	3	20	5	4.266 *	.05
Rudeness, impudence to teachers	11	1	21	7	6.75 *	.01
Shyness, timidity, withdrawing	14	2	14	10	7.56 *	.01
Acting smart	3	9	14	14	2.08	.20
Unhappiness, depression	12	2	24	2	4.785 *	.05
Daydreaming	10	6	6	18	.563	.50
Slovenly appearance	11	3	2	24	4.57 *	.05
Sissy or tomboy	8	3	3	26	1.45	.30
No interest in classwork	14	1	20	5	9.60 *	.01
Sex offense	14	0	21	5	12.07	.001
Eating candy, etc. in school	4	8	2	26	.750	.50
"Horseplay"	6	10	4	20	.563	.50
Physical attack on teacher	8	1	27	4		p=.044 *

*Significant at the .05 level of confidence.

TABLE VI

PRE-TEST AND POST-TEST CHANGE IN THE PERCEIVED LEVELS-OF-SERIOUSNESS OF BEHAVIORAL PROBLEMS FOR THE CONTROL GROUP

Behavioral Problems	Cell A Changed High to Low	Cell D Changed Low to High	Cell B No Change High	Cell C No Change Low	Obtained X^2	Significance Level
Running in the hall	5	9	6	20	.6428	.50
General rudeness and inconsideration for other students	11	9	15	5	.0500	.90
Cheating on class assignments and/or test	11	8	15	6	.2105	.70
Defacing school property and/or equipment	7	2	27	4		p=.224
Habitual tardiness	8	9	10	13	.0588	.90
Committing petty thievery	9	4	25	2	1.231	.30
Lying, untruthfulness	15	7	14	4	2.227	.50
Masturbation	13	8	7	12	.7619	.70
Truancy	11	8	16	5	2.105	.50
Swearing, using profane language	11	10	8	11	0.00	
Smoking	13	13	8	6	0.00	
Obscene notes, talk	7	10	14	9	.2352	.90
Playing with genitalia	12	8	9	11	.4500	.70
Disorderliness in classroom	4	11	8	17	2.400	.50
Whispering	8	10	0	22	.0555	.90
Interrupting	9	11	3	17	.2000	.70
Failure to pay attention	12	11	9	8	0.00	
Carelessness, inaccuracy in work	12	8	9	11	.4500	.70
Physical laziness	8	11	6	15	.2105	.70
Willful disobedience	10	7	17	6	.2352	.70
Cruelty, bullying	14	7	13	6	1.714	.20
Quarrelsomeness	6	8	10	16	.0714	.80

TABLE VI (Continued)

Behavioral Problems	Cell A Changed High to Low	Cell D Changed Low to High	Cell B No Change High	Cell C No Change Low	Obtained X^2	Significance Level
Tattling on others	4	8	4	24	.7500	.50
Stubbornness, contrariness	9	7	8	16	.0625	.90
Rages, temper tantrums	15	10	11	4	.6400	.80
Rudeness, impudence to teachers	12	8	11	9	.4500	.70
Shyness, timidity, withdrawing	16	4	9	11	6.050 *	.02
Acting smart	8	10	6	16	.0555	.90
Unhappiness, depression	13	2	22	3	6.666 *	.01
Daydreaming	8	11	4	17	.2105	.70
Slovenly appearance	5	3	5	27		p=.547
Sissy or tomboy	9	8	1	22	0.00	
No interest in classwork	8	11	16	5	.2105	.70
Sex offense	11	3	23	3	3.500	.10
Eating candy, etc. in school	0	6	1	33		p=.032*
"Horseplay"	3	6	4	27		p=.732
Physical attack on teacher	10	1	25	4	5.818 *	.02

*Significant at .05 level of confidence.

very small (less than 5). Since all possible observations from the population fell into either one of the two discrete categories the Binomial Test was suitable and the test indicated the probability with which the frequencies or proportions observed could have been drawn from the population. Two-tailed probabilities are given in the right margin in the Tables V and VI under the significance level heading.

The data presented in Table V indicate that, of the thirty-seven behavioral problems on the B.P.I., the experimental group subjects showed significant change in level-of-seriousness perceptions between the pre-test and the post-test on twenty-two behavioral problems:

General Rudeness and Inconsideration For Other Students. General rudeness and inconsideration for other students was perceived as of high seriousness by thirty-two experimental subjects with eleven subjects changing their perceptions from high perceived level-of-seriousness to low.

Cheating on Class Assignments and/or Tests. Cheating on class assignments and/or tests was perceived by thirty-five subjects to be of high seriousness on the pre-test and seventeen changed their seriousness perception to low seriousness on the post-test.

Defacing School Property and/or Equipment. Of the thirty-five experimental subjects whose pre-test perceived level-of-seriousness was high for defacing school property and/or equipment, seventeen changed their seriousness perception to low on the post-test.

Habitual Tardiness. Habitual tardiness was perceived as of high seriousness on the pre-test by twenty-six subjects, of which eleven changed their seriousness perception on the post-test to a low seriousness level.

Committing Petty Thievery. Thirty-six subjects perceived the item committing petty thievery to be of high seriousness on the pre-test while the post-test indicated that ten subjects changed their seriousness perception to low seriousness level.

Masturbation. Masturbation was perceived to be of high seriousness on the pre-test by twenty-one subjects and fifteen subjects' perceptions changed to low seriousness.

Truancy. Truancy was perceived by thirty-two subjects to be of high seriousness on the pre-test. Sixteen subjects changed to a low perception of seriousness on the post-test.

Smoking. Thirty-one subjects perceived smoking as of high seriousness on the pre-test while seventeen of the thirty-one subjects deemed smoking to be of low seriousness when they responded on the post-test.

Obscene Notes, Talk. Obscene notes, talk was perceived on the pre-test to be of high seriousness by thirty subjects, but on the post-test fourteen changed their perceived level-of-seriousness to low.

Playing With Genitalia. Playing with genitalia was perceived to be of high seriousness on the pre-test by twenty-four subjects with sixteen subjects changing to low seriousness on the post-test.

Interrupting. Twenty-seven experimental group subjects perceived this item to be of low perceived level-of-seriousness on the pre-test and fifteen other subjects changed their perception on this item to high seriousness on the post-test.

Failure to Pay Attention. This item was perceived by twenty-six subjects as of high seriousness on the pre-test and seven subjects changed their perceived level-of-seriousness to low on the post-test.

Willful Disobedience. The pre-test responses indicated that thirty-three subjects perceived this behavioral problem as a high level-of-seriousness item. Thirteen subjects changed their perception of the seriousness of this item to low on the post-test.

Cruelty, Bullying. Thirty-four subjects perceived this item as of high seriousness on the pre-test with fourteen changing in their perceptions, of this item, to low seriousness on the post-test.

Rages, Temper Tantrums. This item was perceived on the pre-test by thirty-two subjects to be of high seriousness. On the post-test, twelve subjects changed in their perception to low seriousness.

Rudeness, Impudence to Teachers. Only eight experimental group subjects perceived this item to be of low seriousness on the pre-test and one changed his perception from low to high on the post-test. Eleven subjects changed perceptions from high seriousness on the pre-test to low seriousness on the post-test.

Shyness, Timidity, Withdrawing. This behavioral problem was perceived by twenty-eight subjects as of high seriousness on the pre-test. However, it was perceived as of high seriousness on the post-test by only sixteen subjects. Twelve subjects perceived this item on the pre-test as of low seriousness but twenty-four perceived it as of low seriousness on the post-test.

Unhappiness, Depression. Thirty-six subjects perceived this problem to be of high seriousness on the pre-test while twenty-six perceived it as high level of seriousness on the post-test.

No Interest in Classwork. Thirty-four subjects perceived this problem to be of high seriousness on the pre-test. Fourteen of these subjects changed their perceptions to low seriousness on the post-test.

Sex Offense. Thirty-five subjects perceived sex offense problems to be of high seriousness on the pre-test while fourteen of these subjects changed their perceptions to low seriousness on the post-test.

Physical Attack on Teacher. The pre-test responses indicated thirty-five subjects perceived this problem to be of high level-of-seriousness. However, eight subjects changed their perceptions to low seriousness on the post-test.

The data presented in Table VI indicate that, of the thirty-seven behavioral problems, the control group showed significant change between the pre-test and the post-test on only four behavioral problem items. The significant items were:

Shyness, Timidity, Withdrawing. Twenty-five subjects in the control group perceived this problem to be of high seriousness on the pre-test. Sixteen subjects changed their perceptions to low seriousness on the post-test.

Unhappiness, Depression. This behavioral problem was perceived on the pre-test to be of high seriousness by thirty-five control group subjects. Thirteen subjects changed their perceived level-of-seriousness to low on the post-test.

Eating Candy, etc. in School. This behavioral problem was perceived to be of low seriousness by thirty-nine control group subjects. Six of these changed from a perception of low seriousness to high seriousness. Only four subjects perceived it of high seriousness on the post-test.

Physical Attack on Teacher. Thirty-five control subjects perceived this problem to be of high seriousness at the time the pre-test was administered. Ten of these subjects changed their perception of

this problem item to low seriousness on the post-test.

The chi-square values obtained for each of the other thirty-three behavioral problems were not statistically significant at or beyond the .05 level of confidences.

Presented in Table VII are the post-test raw frequency responses and obtained chi-square values derived from the B.P.I. data of the experimental group and the control group elementary school student teachers. Presented in Table VII are the comparisons of the experimental and the control groups as they were assigned to lower socio-economic status schools and to other than lower socio-economic status schools. Each group of student teachers, assigned to the lower socio-economic status schools or to the other than lower socio-economic status schools was comprised of twenty subjects.

Each of the experimental and control socio-economic groups of subjects responded to the thirty-seven items on the B.P.I. The perceived level-of-seriousness of behavioral problems responses were checked on the B.P.I., by the respondents, as of high seriousness, as of medium seriousness, and as of low seriousness.

To test the Hypotheses Four and Five, the raw frequency responses for the groups were tallied and cast into (2 x 3) contingency tables for each possible permutation for the experimental and the control group in relationship to each socio-economic school status assignment. Siegel's (1956) Chi-Square Test for Significance of Difference was utilized to test whether the experimental and the control groups in differing socio-economic status school assignments differed in respect to post-test frequency of responses in the three perceived level-of-seriousness categories. Statistical significance at or beyond the

TABLE VII

TOTAL B.P.I. RESPONSES REFLECTING PERCEIVED LEVEL-OF-SERIOUSNESS OF BEHAVIORAL PROBLEMS AND OBTAINED CHI-SQUARE VALUES BY STUDENT TEACHERS IN DESIGNATED SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS SCHOOLS

Student Teacher Groups (n=20)	Assignment to Socio-Economic Status Schools	Perceived Level-of-Seriousness Post-Test Raw Scores			Obtained Chi-Square Values	Significance Level
		High	Medium	Low		
Experimental	Lower	166	365	193		
Control	Lower	186	291	253	17.5286 *	.001
Experimental	Other	160	343	226		
Control	Other	195	301	239	7.7411 *	.05
Experimental	Lower	166	365	193		
Experimental	Other	160	343	226	3.3760	
Control	Lower	186	291	253		
Control	Other	195	301	239	.7627	
Experimental	Other	160	343	226		
Control	Lower	186	291	252	7.7411 *	.05
Experimental	Lower	166	365	193		
Control	Other	195	301	239	13.2950 *	.01

*Significant at the .05 level of confidence.

.05 level of confidence was established in all cases marked with an asterisk. Significance levels obtained are also shown.

A statistical significance at the .001 level of confidence was found on the post-test for the experimental and the control group in assignments at the lower socio-economic status school. The data indicate that the control group tended to rate the list of thirty-seven behavioral problems to be of lower perceived level-of-seriousness. The experimental group considered the problems, generally, to be of medium level-of-seriousness. A significant difference was established on the post-test at the .05 level of confidence for the experimental group and the control group in relation to assignment to other than lower socio-economic status schools.

On the post-test, the control group assigned to other socio-economic status schools perceived the behavioral problems as being of somewhat higher seriousness than did the experimental group. The Hypotheses Four and Five were rejected. There was a difference between the two groups' student teachers' perceptions of the seriousness of behavioral problems in relation to the socio-economic school assignment.

The Behavioral Treatment Response Sheet

The behavioral treatment response sheet (B.T.R.S.) was administered to each elementary school student teacher in this investigation with explicit instructions to select a treatment for each behavioral problem listed on the B.P.I. and B.T.R.S. The primary purpose of the B.T.R.S. was two-fold. It was an attempt to determine any difference in selected treatments for behavioral problems and to detect any

attitudinal change as reflected by desirable and undesirable treatment selections by the elementary school student teachers in either group.

Chapters I and III discussed the rationale for the division of the treatment list into the two categories of desirable treatments and undesirable treatments. Each subject was allowed to choose freely any treatment for any behavioral problem but was directed to select one for each problem. These data are presented in Tables VIII, IX, X, XI, and XII and are included in the study to test Hypotheses Two, Three, Six, and Seven.

Hypothesis Two stated: The proposed desirable or undesirable treatment of behavioral problems of elementary school pupils does not differ significantly between those student teachers who participate in intensive human relations laboratory experiences in addition to the traditional student teaching program and those student teachers who participate only in the traditional student teaching program.

Hypothesis Three stated: The attitudes of student teachers toward behavioral problems as reflected by desirable or undesirable proposed treatment of the behavioral problems, does not change significantly between student teachers who participate in intensive human relations laboratory experiences and those student teachers who participate only in the traditional student teaching program.

Hypothesis Six stated: The proposed treatment of elementary pupil behavioral problems does not differ between student teachers in lower socio-economic status school teaching assignments, who participate in student teaching with intensive human relations laboratory experiences, and those student teachers in lower socio-economic status school student teaching assignments, who participate only in the traditional

student teaching program.

Hypothesis Seven stated: The proposed treatment of elementary pupil behavioral problems does not differ between student teachers in other socio-economic status school teaching assignments, who participate in student teaching with intensive human relations laboratory experiences, and those student teachers in other socio-economic status school student teaching assignments, who participate only in the traditional student teaching program.

To test Hypothesis Two, the post-test data concerning desirable and undesirable behavioral treatments were summarized for both groups of subjects. These data were tabulated for each of the thirty-seven behavioral problems. The desirable and undesirable categories were then summed over all thirty-seven behavioral problems.

The data were placed in (2 x 2) contingency tables and Chi-square Test was utilized to determine if there was a statistically significant different proportion of response cases in either category for the experimental group and the control group. A chi-square obtained value of .5301 was computed. The chi-square obtained value was not significant at the .05 level of confidence. The chi-square value obtained was required to equal or exceed the critical value of 3.84 in order to obtain significance. Presented in Table VIII are the data for the itemized behavioral problems which show the treatment selection responses for the experimental and the control groups, cast into the desirable treatments and undesirable treatments categories. The chi-square obtained value or the probability computed using the Fisher's Exact Probability Test for each behavioral problem is shown in the right margin of Table VIII. No significance at or beyond the .05 level

TABLE VIII

BEHAVIORAL PROBLEMS TREATMENT POST-TEST SUMMARY CATEGORIZED BY DESIRABLE AND UNDESIRABLE TREATMENTS BY THE EXPERIMENTAL GROUP AND THE CONTROL GROUP

Behavioral Problems	Experimental Group		Control Group		X^2 Value	Fisher's Exact Probability Test
	Desirable	Undesirable	Desirable	Undesirable		
Running in the hall	39	1	39	1		p=1.00
General rudeness and inconsideration for other students	19	21	18	22	0.00	
Cheating on class assignments and/or tests	36	4	36	4		p=1.00
Defacing school property and/or equipment	32	8	26	14	1.567	
Habitual tardiness	39	1	39	1		p=1.00
Committing petty thievery	38	2	37	3		p= .99986
Lying, untruthfulness	39	1	38	2		p= .99990
Masturbation	40	0	38	2		p= .4936
Truancy	38	2	40	0		p= .4936
Swearing, using profane language	36	4	36	4		p=1.00
Smoking	38	2	38	2		p=1.00
Obscene notes, talk	37	3	38	2		p= .99986
Playing with genitalia	40	0	37	3		p= .2404
Disorderliness in classroom	36	4	37	3		p= .99990
Whispering, writing notes	40	0	37	3		p= .2404
Interrupting	37	3	37	3		p=1.00
Failure to pay attention	37	3	39	1		p= .61516
Carelessness, inaccuracy in work	39	1	39	1		p=1.00
Physical laziness	39	1	37	3		p= .61516
Willful disobedience	33	7	38	2		p= .08429
Cruelty, bullying	31	9	35	5	.7792	

TABLE VIII (Continued)

Behavioral Problems	Experimental Group		Control Group		X^2 Value	Fisher's Exact Probability Test
	Desirable	Undesirable	Desirable	Undesirable		
Quarrelsomeness	36	4	36	4		p=1.00
Tattling on others	38	2	39	1		p= .9985
Stubbornness, contrariness	39	1	38	2		p= .9999
Rages, temper tantrums	36	4	35	5		p= .99994
Rudeness, impudence to teachers	35	5	34	6	0.00	
Shyness, timidity, withdrawing	36	4	40	0		p= .1156
Acting smart	33	7	36	4	.4216	
Unhappiness, depression	38	2	39	1		p= .99998
Daydreaming	35	5	40	0		p= .05474
Slovenly appearance	40	0	40	0	0.00	
Sissy or tomboy	38	2	39	1		p= .99998
No interest in classwork	40	0	38	2		p= .7560
Sex offense	37	3	35	5		p= .71190
Eating candy, etc. in school	36	4	35	5		p= .93672
"Horseplay"	35	5	38	2		p= .56378
Physical attack on teacher	33	7	25	15	3.072	
TOTAL	1310	164	1325	151	.5301	

of confidence was indicated by either statistical test, thus Hypothesis Two was not rejected and it was found to be tenable. There was no significant difference in the proposed desirable or undesirable treatment of behavioral problems of elementary school pupils between the student teachers in the experimental group and the student teachers in the control group.

As discussed in Chapters I and III, eleven of the twenty-two treatments listed on the B.T.R.S. were deemed desirable and eleven treatments were viewed as undesirable methods of treating pupil behavioral problems. These twenty-two treatments are presented in Tables IX and X. Shown in Table IX are the desirable treatments and the pre-test and post-test frequency responses for both the experimental group and the control group. Upon inspection of the data in Table IX, it was evident that both groups frequently selected the pupil-teacher conference for treatment of the behavioral problems and, conversely, isolation of the pupil as a treatment was not frequently selected by either group.

Presented in Table X are the undesirable treatments and the pre-test and post-test frequency responses for both the experimental group and the control group. Upon inspection of the data in Table X, having a pupil apologize to the teacher or the class was favored. Sending the pupil to the principal's office was frequently selected by both the experimental and the control group subjects.

To test Hypothesis Three, a statistical test of the B.T.R.S. data concerning each selected treatment was required. The treatment selections on the B.T.R.S. were tallied for the experimental group and for the control group in the desirable treatment or undesirable treatment

TABLE IX

TOTAL EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUP RESPONSES SHOWING CHOICE OF DESIRABLE TREATMENTS LISTED ON THE B.T.R.S. PRE-TEST AND POST-TEST

Desirable Treatments	Experimental Group		Control Group	
	Pre-test	Post-test	Pre-test	Post-test
1. Give pupil opportunity to make contribution to class	133	80	132	84
3. Teacher uses simple control (a look, nod of head, etc.)	122	117	112	146
4. Parent-teacher conference	165	136	189	149
7. Pupil-teacher conference	335	472	416	578
10. Pupil loses some privilege	30	54	57	40
11. Pupil referred to special service personnel	86	68	4	34
14. Role playing	37	39	32	35
15. Isolate the pupil	9	25	3	6
16. Emphasize good qualities of child's behavior	89	64	48	37
17. Accept misbehavior as normal for child and attempt to change through a positive approach	192	122	182	100
22. Assess and improve through group discussions	123	133	97	116
TOTALS :	1321	1310	1272	1325

TABLE X

TOTAL EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUP RESPONSES SHOWING CHOICE OF UNDESIRABLE TREATMENTS LISTED ON THE B.T.R.S. PRE-TEST AND POST-TEST

Undesirable Treatments	Experimental Group		Control Group	
	Pre-test	Post-test	Pre-test	Post-test
2. Pupil apologizes	58	51	62	42
5. Teacher lowers grade	4	7	3	2
6. Detention after school	8	4	13	3
8. Pupil temporarily suspended from room	2	11	5	5
9. Pupil temporarily suspended from school	0	1	27	0
12. Corporal punishment is used	3	4	4	7
13. Send child to principal's office	43	47	23	34
18. Physical control of student	21	15	17	19
19. Require additional assignment	4	4	4	5
20. Some action by fellow students	20	7	26	11
21. Behavior called to attention of other class members	5	13	6	23
TOTALS	168	164	170	151

categories on both the pre-test and the post-test. The frequency of each treatment's selection was previously presented in Tables IX and X.

The data for the B.T.R.S. pre-test were totaled for each group and cast into (2 x 2) contingency tables containing cells arranged according to the experimental group, the control group, desirable treatment selection and undesirable treatment selection. The Chi-square Test for Significance was utilized in an attempt to determine if there was a significant group difference in the proportions of the treatment selections on the pre-test.

The chi-square value obtained was .1378. Since the predetermined .05 level of confidence required an obtained chi-square value of 3.84 there was no significant difference in the proportion of selected treatments, either desirable or undesirable, between the experimental group and the control group on the pre-test B.T.R.S. responses.

The same procedure was utilized with the category totals on the B.T.R.S. post-test data following the exposure to the traditional teaching program for the control group and to student teaching with the additional treatment variable for the experimental group. The chi-square value obtained for the B.T.R.S. post-test data totals was .5301 which also indicated that there was no significant difference in the proportions of desirable treatment choices and undesirable treatment choices between the experimental and the control group.

This statistical comparison of groups indicated that there was no significant statistical difference in the treatments of behavioral problems selected either on the B.T.R.S. pre-test or on the B.T.R.S. post-test. This test implies that the two groups of subjects, in relation to the desirable treatment selection and to the undesirable

treatment selection, did not differ or change as a result of experimentally induced conditions as specified by the investigation procedures. Thus, the investigator failed to reject Hypothesis Three.

The data presented in Tables IX and X were further examined for significant statistical difference between the experimental group and the control group in relation to the pre-test B.T.R.S. responses and the post-test B.T.R.S. responses for each treatment.

The Chi-square Test for Significance and where required, the Fisher's Exact Probability Test (Siegel, 1956) were utilized in an attempt to locate significant group difference in the itemized treatment selections. To utilize these tests, the data for each treatment item for each group were placed in (2 x 2) contingency tables. The chi-square formula used to test the data was as Siegel (1956, p. 104) stated:

$$X^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{r} \sum_{j=1}^{k} \frac{(O_{ij}-E_{ij})^2}{E_{ij}}$$

When the total N was less than twenty and when the smallest expected cell frequency was less than five, Siegel's (1956, p. 97) formula for the Fisher's Exact Probability Test was used as follows:

$$p = \frac{(A+B)!(C+D)!(A+C)!(B+D)!}{N!\ A!\ B!\ C!\ D!}$$

Where the observed frequencies were insignificant but all more extreme possible outcomes of the same marginal totals could have been significant, Tocher's modification was used to determine statistical rejection. In this manner, the proportion of experimental group responses on the pre-test and post-test B.T.R.S. treatment items were compared with the

proportion of such responses from the control group. These data are presented in Table XI.

Presented in Table XI are each of the treatment selections by each group with the chi-square values or the Fisher's exact probability for each treatment item. Statistical significance between groups on each treatment is shown at the right of the table by an asterisk. Chi-square obtained values and Fisher's exact probabilities are also presented. In Table XI only two of the twenty-two treatment items showed statistical significance between the pre-test and the post-test. They were item number 10, pupil loses some privilege, in which the experimental group increased while the control decreased on their post-tests; and item number 11, pupil referred to special service personnel, in which the experimental group decreased and the control group increased greatly.

To test Hypotheses Six and Seven, the total B.T.R.S. post-test responses were categorized as desirable and as undesirable proposed treatments for behavioral problems. The data were compared in (2 x 2) contingency tables utilizing the Chi-Square Test for Significance. Shown in Table XII are the categorized data for the experimental group and for the control group. The data are arranged as they were compared in relation to the student teachers' assignments to the lower and to the other socio-economic status schools. The data, when permutations of groups and socio-economic status school assignments were compared, yielded only one significant chi-square value which was greater than the critical value of 3.84 at the .05 level of confidence, with one degree of freedom, which indicated statistical significance.

TABLE XI

A COMPARISON OF THE EXPERIMENTAL GROUP AND THE CONTROL GROUP ON PRE-TEST AND POST-TEST RESPONSES FOR EACH BEHAVIORAL TREATMENT LISTED ON THE B.T.R.S.

Desirable Treatments	Experimental Group		Control Group		Obtained X^2	Fisher's Exact Probability
	Pre-test	Post-test	Pre-test	Post-test		
1. Give pupil opportunity to make contribution to class	133	80	132	84	.0339	
3. Teacher uses simple control (a look, nod of head, etc.)	122	117	112	146	2.6045	
4. Parent-teacher conference	165	136	189	149	.0397	
7. Pupil-teacher conference	335	472	416	578	.00944	
10. Pupil loses some privilege	30	54	57	40	8.6791 *	
11. Pupil referred to special service personnel	86	68	4	41	29.12808*	
14. Role playing	37	39	32	35	.00330	
15. Isolate the pupil	9	25	3	6	.00009	p= .57448
16. Emphasize good qualities of child's behavior	89	64	48	37	.01376	
17. Accept misbehavior as normal for child and attempt to change through a positive approach	192	122	182	100	.59360	
22. Assess and improve through group discussion	123	133	97	116	.20137	
Undesirable Treatments						
2. Pupil apologizes	58	51	62	42	.64615	
5. Teacher lowers grade	4	7	3	2		p= .73074

TABLE XI (Continued)

Undesirable Treatments	Experimental Group		Control Group		Obtained X^2	Fisher's Exact Probability
	Pre-test	Post-test	Pre-test	Post-test		
6. Detention after school	8	4	13	3		p= .65502
8. Pupil temporarily suspended from room	2	11	5	5		p= .16034
9. Pupil temporarily suspended from school	0	1	27	0		p= .07142
12. Corporal punishment is used	3	4	4	7		p=1.00
13. Send child to principal's office	43	47	23	33	.38528	
18. Physical control of student	21	15	17	19	.50144	
19. Require additional assignment	4	4	4	5		p=1.00
20. Some action by fellow students	20	7	26	10	.0151	
21. Behavior called to attention of other class members	5	13	6	23		p=1.00

*Significant at the .05 level of confidence.

TABLE XII

TOTAL B.T.R.S. RESPONSES CATEGORIZED AS DESIRABLE AND UNDESIRABLE PROPOSED TREATMENTS OF BEHAVIORAL PROBLEMS AND OBTAINED CHI-SQUARE SCORES BY STUDENT TEACHERS IN DESIGNATED SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS SCHOOLS

Student Teacher Group	Assignment to Socio-Economic Status Schools	Post-Test Raw Scores		Obtained Chi-Square Values
		Desirable	Undesirable	
Experimental	Lower	665	75	
Control	Lower	662	78	.0291
Experimental	Other	683	57	
Control	Other	685	55	.0096
Experimental	Lower	665	75	
Experimental	Other	683	57	2.4037
Control	Lower	662	78	
Control	Other	685	55	3.9984 *
Experimental	Other	683	57	
Control	Lower	662	78	3.2603
Experimental	Lower	665	75	
Control	Other	685	55	3.0443

*Significant at the .05 level of confidence.

The control group lower socio-economic and the control group other socio-economic data comparison yielded an obtained chi-square value of 3.9984 which was significant at the .05 level of confidence. Analysis of this data would seem to indicate that the student teachers assigned to the lower socio-economic status schools tended to select fewer desirable and more undesirable behavioral problem treatments than did the control group student teachers assigned to other socio-economic status schools.

There was no instance of significant difference between the experimental group's and the control group's selection of desirable and undesirable behavioral problems treatments in relation to student teaching assignment in socio-economic status school categories. Thus, Hypotheses Six and Seven are tenable and cannot be rejected.

Summary

Chapter IV has presented the procedural treatment and the statistical analysis of data collected through the use of the B.P.I. and the B.T.R.S. for this experimental investigation. The data were presented in tabular format with appropriate discussion concerning the statistical test of significance and the results obtained. Statistical confidence was specified at the .05 confidence level and the null hypotheses were put to the test. Hypotheses One, Two, Three, Six and Seven were tenable. Hypotheses Four and Five were rejected.

Chapter V will present a summary, findings, conclusions, further considerations and recommendations for further research in areas related to this study.

CHAPTER V

INTRODUCTORY SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, FURTHER CONSIDERATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introductory Summary

This study was conceived and designed to explore the question of whether elementary school student teachers exposed to intensive human relations laboratory experiences, in addition to the traditional student teaching experiences, would differ in their perception and treatment of behavioral problems of elementary school children. It was conducted with a sample of 1968-1969 Oklahoma State University elementary school student teachers in two large Oklahoma metropolitan school systems. The independent variable was the intensive human relations laboratory experiences provided in addition to student teaching. The two instruments used in the study were The Behavioral Problems Inventory and The Behavioral Problems Treatment Response Sheet created by Dobson (1966). The B.P.I. was used to determine the elementary school student teachers' perception of that which constituted misbehavior on the part of the kindergarten through grade six pupil. The B.T.R.S. was used to identify the types of behavioral treatments selected and the attitudes of elementary school student teachers as reflected by the selection of desirable or undesirable treatment types.

The participating elementary schools in the two metropolitan cities were selected at random from those schools classed as E.S.E.A.

Title I project schools for 1968-1969 and from those not so classified by the school systems' administrations. The eighty randomly assigned elementary school student teachers were divided randomly into two groups of forty each; of which one, the experimental group, was exposed to the independent variable. The other group, the control group, received no treatment other than the student teaching experience.

The experimental group's intensive human relations laboratory experiences were accomplished by dividing the large group of forty subjects randomly into four small groups, of ten subjects each, permitting manageable groups which could experience interaction. The two groups of forty elementary school student teachers were assigned one-half (twenty subjects) to lower socio-economic status schools (Title I), and one-half (twenty subjects) to other than lower socio-economic status schools (not Title I).

The lower socio-economic status schools (Title I) and the other socio-economic status schools (not Title I) in each metropolitan city were assigned ten student teachers so that both the experimental group and the control group were represented equally in the two cities. The school population taught by these groups of elementary school student teachers were those pupils regularly enrolled in kindergarten through grade six.

The data collected for this study were analyzed through the use of appropriate statistical techniques with statistical significance established at the .05 level of confidence.

Findings

The findings of this investigation considered to be most important

and of significant value were the following:

1) The Hypothesis One was not rejected and thus was tenable. It stated: Student teacher perception of the seriousness of behavioral problems which frequently constitute elementary pupil misbehavior does not differ significantly between student teachers who participate in intensive human relations laboratory experiences in addition to the traditional student teaching program and student teachers who participate only in the traditional student teaching program.

2) The Hypothesis Two was not rejected and thus was tenable. It stated: The proposed desirable or undesirable treatment of behavioral problems of elementary school pupils does not differ significantly between those student teachers who participate in intensive human relations laboratory experiences in addition to the traditional student teaching program and those student teachers who participate only in the traditional student teaching program.

3) The Hypothesis Three was not rejected and thus was tenable. It stated: The attitudes of student teachers toward behavioral problems as reflected by desirable or undesirable proposed treatment of the behavioral problems, do not change significantly between student teachers who participate in intensive human relations laboratory experiences and those student teachers who participate only in the traditional student teaching program.

4) The Hypothesis Four was rejected. There was a significant difference in the perception of the seriousness of behavioral problems between control group and the experimental group in relation to lower socio-economic status school assignment. Hypothesis Four stated: The perceived level-of-seriousness of behavioral problems does not

differ between student teachers in lower socio-economic status school student teaching assignments, who participate in student teaching with intensive human relations laboratory experiences, and those student teachers in lower socio-economic status school student teaching assignments, who participate only in the traditional student teaching program.

5) The Hypothesis Five was rejected. There was a significant difference in the perception of the seriousness of behavioral problems between the control group and the experimental group in relation to other socio-economic status school assignment. Hypothesis Five stated: The perceived level-of-seriousness of behavioral problems does not differ between student teachers in other socio-economic status school student teaching assignments, who participate in student teaching with intensive human relations laboratory experiences, and those student teachers in other socio-economic status school student teaching assignments, who participate only in the traditional student teaching program.

6) The Hypothesis Six was not rejected and thus was tenable. It stated: The proposed treatment of elementary pupil behavioral problems does not differ between student teachers in lower socio-economic status school teaching assignments, who participate in student teaching with intensive human relations laboratory experiences, and those student teachers in lower socio-economic status school student teaching assignments, who participate only in the traditional student teaching program.

7) The Hypothesis Seven was not rejected and thus was tenable. It stated: The proposed treatment of elementary pupil behavioral problems does not differ between student teachers in other socio-economic status school teaching assignments, who participate in student teaching with intensive human relations laboratory experiences, and those

student teachers in other socio-economic status school student teaching assignments, who participate only in the traditional student teaching program.

8) There were thirteen behavioral problems identified by the B.P.I. which received a ranking between one and fourteen. This indicated a general agreement in perceived high level-of-seriousness by both the experimental group and the control group on both the pre-test and the post-test. These thirteen behavioral problems were: committing petty thievery, defacing school property and/or equipment, sex offense, physical attack on teacher, unhappiness and depression, willful disobedience, no interest in classwork, cheating on class assignments and/or tests, general rudeness and inconsideration for other students, truancy, lying and untruthfulness, rages and temper tantrums, and cruelty and bullying. These behavioral acts were considered as of a high seriousness level by all student teachers involved in the investigation. Conversely such behavioral acts receiving low seriousness ratings and rankings were: daydreaming, acting smart, tattling on others, interrupting, whispering, writing notes, running in the halls, slovenly appearance, sissy or tomboy, eating in school and horseplay.

9) The experimental group showed statistically significant change in the perceived level-of-seriousness on twenty-two of the thirty-seven behavioral problems while the control group indicated significant perceived level-of-seriousness changes on only four behavioral problems.

10) There was no statistically significant difference between the experimental group and the control group in the post-test selection of

desirable and undesirable behavioral problem treatments.

11) There was no statistically significant difference between the experimental group and the control group in relation to the thirty-seven behavior problems' treatments selected either as desirable or as undesirable.

12) The experimental group and the control group generally selected desirable behavioral treatments on both the pre-test and the post-test.

13) The treatments: pupil-teacher conference, the parent-teacher conference, assessment and group discussion of problems, and acceptance of behavior as normal, were proposed frequently by both the experimental group and the control group.

14) Both the experimental group and the control group chose some undesirable behavioral problem treatments. The most frequently selected were: pupil apologizes, send child to principal's office, physical control of student, and some action by fellow students.

15) Least chosen behavioral problems treatments for both groups on the pre-test and post-test were: teacher lowers grade, corporal punishment is used, and require additional assignment.

16) Statistically significant difference existed between the pre-test and post-test for the experimental group and the control group on two desirable treatments; pupil loses some privilege and pupil referred to special service personnel, with a near statistically significant finding (.07) for pupil temporarily suspended from school.

Conclusions

The following conclusions have been drawn from the findings of

this study:

1) The behavioral problems or acts of children for which there was general agreement in ranking by both the experimental group and the control group appear to be those which could be termed extra-legal, violations of school orderliness and teacher regulations and questions of morality and other social group norm violations.

2) Both the experimental group and the control group recognized as serious the withdrawing child in ranking unhappiness and depression as of high seriousness which seems to be supportive of the notion that teachers are becoming cognizant of detrimental mental health conditions in childhood. The inclusion of rages and temper tantrums as well as cruelty and bullying as serious problems also tends to imply this. This notion has been reinforced by statements by mental hygienists.

3) Since the experimental group experienced the treatment variable and since the perceived level-of-seriousness on twenty-two individual behavioral problems changed significantly, one may suggest that the treatment variable may have had an effect upon some experimental group elementary school student teachers.

4) There was indication that the Oklahoma State University student teachers exhibited humanistic attitudes which were reflected by desirable treatments of behavior problems, in that there was no significant difference between the control group and the experimental group and that both groups selected frequently those behavior problem treatments deemed desirable.

5) The increased emphasis upon child growth and development by teacher preparation institutions has been reflected in the attitudes of most of the Oklahoma State University student teacher candidates in

this sample, because the pre-test and post-test responses showed no statistically significant difference in the selection of treatments and both groups generally selected desirable behavioral problem treatments.

6) The similar perception of the behavioral items, by the two groups of student teachers, in relation to those of mental hygienists tend to emphasize that opinion, personal judgement and value orientation may be areas of consideration in methods coursework. The similar rank ordering of behavioral problem seriousness by both groups may illustrate this notion as presented in Table IV.

7) Student teachers in this sample at Oklahoma State University appear to be cognizant of desirable procedures, as expressed in educational research literature, for treating behavioral problems of elementary school children because they generally selected educative treatments.

8) Oklahoma State University student teachers in this sample appear to accept children in terms of the social and behavioral standards of childhood and do not determine behavior solely using personal standards of deportment as revealed by perceived low level-of-seriousness for such childhood behaviors as horseplay, eating in school, slovenly appearance, daydreaming, acting smart, stubbornness and contrariness, tattling on others, interrupting, whispering and writing notes, and running in the hall.

9) Oklahoma State University elementary school student teachers, in this sample, deemed the process of involving the pupil and his parents with the teacher in the educational process as important to the welfare of the child, the parent and the school as indicated by frequent selection of the conference methods of problem treatment.

10) Oklahoma State University elementary school student teachers, in this sample, generally did not perceive corporal punishment as an effective method of child behavioral problem treatment.

11) The experimental group showed some indication of gaining greater inward confidence in handling misbehavior themselves as they selected the treatment "referring the child to special services personnel" in fewer post-test instances. The control group showed a significant increase in the selection of this treatment item.

Further Considerations

The growing acceptance by public schools of the modern dynamic, psycho-social view of child development has created adjustmental problems for the veteran and for the neophyte teachers. It seems that no longer is it appropriate to neglect or ignore the "affective domain" encompassing feelings, values, attitudes and emotive behaviors. The three "R's" no longer comprise the totality of the educational experience. Research has detailed the integrative aspects of physical growth and mental development, personality development and social behaviors.

The modern teacher is responsible, in part, for designing and guiding experiences involving and promoting wholesome development of physical, emotional, social and intellectual growth of pupils. This conceptual orientation charges schools and teachers to acknowledge the "whole child": his family life patterns, his community mores, his cultural patterns, his personality, and his degree of socialized behavior, all of which may or may not show "goodness-of-fit" in a school or in a classroom social system.

All of these forenoted influences may alter a pupil's actual social behavior in the artificial confines of a classroom. Certainly, a teacher must learn to accept and live with such behavior, must learn to view each individual in his own particular set of circumstances without making a judgment of "good" or "bad."

Can teachers deal with pupils from varying socio-economic backgrounds, especially those different from that of the teacher? Are they equipped to adapt to and accept immature, unsocialized behavior in young pupils? Do teachers hold an understanding of human growth and development concepts which allows one to weigh classroom misbehavior in relationships to socio-cultural demands? Are elementary school teachers sufficiently cosmopolitan to see the place of the teacher and the elementary school in the fabric of the culture of which they are a part?

The march of time and progress in teacher training and educational programs seem to have developed changes in teachers' recognition, conceptualization and instructional practices and in accepting the child as a product of socio-cultural environment. However, this phenomenon may be more related to a dynamic society and a more critical analysis of the role of public educational institutions by society in general. Whatever the cause, the pre-service student teachers in this study indicated general agreement on most behavioral treatments deemed desirable. This reflected an attitude which, if carried to the classroom, should create greater pupil acceptance and changed modes of teacher behavior.

Although the intensive human relations laboratory experiences did not promote notable change in the test subjects as revealed by the

chosen instruments, the subjects' verbal and non-verbal responses observed by the leaders in the laboratory sessions, indicated an awakening and a personal stimulation which could have had a pronounced effect upon the classroom behavior of these pre-service teachers. Based upon the observations of and experiences in the experimental group laboratory sessions, the conclusion was reached that teacher education institutions must continue to develop instruction related to the dynamics of child behavior and growth and experiences related to adult human relations and group dynamics as it affects the self-perception and self-awareness of student teachers and ultimately their impact upon pupils.

It is of importance that continual re-orientation of teaching personnel and the public toward a greater understanding of the fact that fixed, pre-determined behavioral standards based on criteria other than sound human growth and development principles and socio-cultural determinants may actually create behavioral problem situations where none existed. Teachers at all socio-economic levels need to experience pupil interactions, be permitted to exchange professional and personal concerns and observations and question fixed attitudes and beliefs so that they may be assisted in understanding what is in the best interest of the young child. This may be a changing role of the teacher education institution.

The public and the parents of children in public schools must be re-oriented to view the mutual roles of responsibility for education of the child which the parent and the school hold. Teachers should be the primary source for the propagation of more acceptable attitudes toward child behavioral problems and the treatment of behavioral problems.

Recommendations

1) Elementary school student teachers need a broader background in psychological, sociological and philosophical theory to act as bases for planning and executing learning experiences for children.

2) Elementary school student teachers need to understand more fully, accept and tolerate "developmental" child behavior as children become socialized.

3) Teacher education needs to emphasize the psycho-social aspect of child development. This emphasis should be in pre-service experiences as well as in-service training. All new and current knowledge of human behavioral dynamics needs to be made available.

4) Elementary school student teachers must be made cognizant of the fact that a balanced value set (personal and social) which avoids extremism and which is keyed to democratic responsibility to a wider societal segment, is desirable in the flexible elementary student teacher.

5) Elementary school student teachers need a variety of "desirable" strategies for dealing with child behavioral problems which afford positive results and which recognize the inherent worth and dignity of the individual.

6) Elementary school student teachers need opportunity to counsel with special services personnel and to know of those services which are available for assisting in the identification and/or solution of child behavioral problems.

7) Elementary school student teachers must become aware that emotional needs of childhood such as love, acceptance, belongingness, security, personal worth, success and participation must be fulfilled

in the redirection of behavior process.

8) Elementary school student teachers need to continue to develop ways in which the public and parents may be oriented to constructive roles which involve them in the educational processes in the interest of all children. The use of conference methods is but one aspect or avenue for this orientation.

Recommendations for Further Research

1) The validity and the findings of this study should be substantiated through additional investigations utilizing the intensive human relations laboratory experiences with student teachers.

2) Further research should identify the dimensions of human relations skills needed and the extent to which the elementary school student teacher of today has a theoretical and practical knowledge of such skills.

3) The relation of socio-economic strata to child behavior patterns in the dynamic social structures of current America merits continuing attention.

4) Research identifying "deviate" behavior and teacher concepts of causative factors in the current American elementary school might afford information relative to the increasing incidence of attacks upon teachers.

5) Research relating the effects of T-group experiences upon the perception and treatment of behavioral problems of elementary school student teachers should prove valuable in developing teacher education programs psychologically orientated toward humanizing the elementary school.

A major goal of educational research should be cumulative investigations of those areas of the psychological, sociological and the philosophical aspects of teachers' attitudes and behavior which affect the teaching-learning situations for the developing child.

A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Addicott, Irwin O. Constructive Classroom Control. San Francisco: Howard Chandler Press, 1958.

Amidon, Edmund, and Giammateo Miller. "The Verbal Behavior of Superior Teachers." The Elementary School Journal, Vol. LXV (February, 1965), 283-285.

Arkin, Herbert, and Raymond R. Colton. Tables For Statisticians. New York: Barnes & Noble, Inc., 1950.

Association for Student Teaching 42nd Yearbook. Dubuque: William C. Brown Co. Inc., 1963.

Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. Perceiving, Behaving, Becoming. Washington, D.C.: The Association, A Department of the National Education Association, 1962.

Auerback, Eugene. "Liberal Arts Opposition to Professors of Education." School and Society. (November 21, 1959), 473-474.

Ausubel, David P. "A Teaching Strategy for Culturally Deprived Pupils: Cognitive and Motivational Considerations." The School Review, Vol. LXXXI (Winter, 1963), 454-463.

Bain, W. E. "A Study of Attitudes of Teachers Toward Behavior Problems." Child Development, Vol. V (1934), 19-34.

Bany, Mary A. and Louis V. Johnson. Classroom Group Behavior. New York: MacMillan Company, 1964.

Barron, Milton. Juvenile in Delinquent Society. New York: Alfred A. Knoff, 1959.

Bidwell, Corrine. "Understanding the Self and Child." Journal of School Health, Vol. 37, No. 8 (October, 1967), 377.

Bilinski, Chester R. "An Analytical Study of Elementary School Classroom Behavior." (unpublished Doctor's dissertation, Oklahoma State University, 1952).

Blackham, Garth J. The Deviant Child In The Classroom. Belmont: Wadsworth Publishing Company, Inc., 1967.

Bowerman, Merle L. The Liberal and Technical In Teacher Education. New York: Columbia University Bureau of Publications, 1956.

Bradford, Leland P. et al. "Promise of Group Dynamics for Education." National Education Association Journal, Vol. XXXVII (September, 1948), 350-352.

Brown, E. J. "So You Have Discipline Problems." Catholic School Journal, Vol. LXIII (November, 1963), 23.

Bruce, William T. and A. John Holden, Jr. The Teachers Personal Development. New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1957.

Bullis, Edmund H. and Emily E. O'Mally. Human Relations in the Classroom. Wilmington: Delaware State Society for Mental Hygiene, 1947.

Burton, William H. The Guidance of Learning Activities. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1962.

Clanz, Edward D., and Robert W. Hayes. Groups in Guidance. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1967.

Combs, Arthur W. Individual Behavior: A Perceptual Approach to Behavior. New York: Harper Brothers, 1959.

Combs, Arthur W. "Intelligence From A Perceptual Point of View." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, Vol. XLVII (July, 1952), 662-673.

Crow, Lester D., and Alice Crow. The Student Teacher in the Elementary School. New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1956. (Revised, 1965).

Deutch, Martin. "Minority Group and Class Status as Related to Social and Personality Factors in Scholastic Achievement." The Society for Applied Anthropology. Monograph No. 2. (1960), 23.

Del Popolo, Joseph A. "Authoritarian Trends In Personality As Related to Attitudinal Traits of Teachers." The Journal of Educational Research, Vol. LIII (March, 1960), 252-257.

Del Popolo, Joseph A. "Teacher Personality: A Concern of Teacher Education." Peabody Journal of Education, Vol. XLIII (July, 1965), 50-55.

Del Solar, Charlotte. Parents and Teachers View the Child. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1949.

Dobson, Russell Lee. "The Perception and Treatment by Teachers of the Behavioral Problems of Elementary School Children In Culturally Deprived and Middle Class Neighborhoods." (unpublished Doctor's dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1966).

Eaton, Merril F., Garret Weathers, and Beeman N. Phillips. "Some Reactions of Classroom Teachers to Problem Behavior in School." Educational Administration and Supervision, Vol. XLIII (March, 1957), 129-139.

Educational Policies Commission. Education and the Disadvantaged American. Washington, D.C.: The Association, A Department of the National Education Association, 1962.

Eels, Kenneth. Intelligence and Cultural Differences. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1951.

Ellis, D. B., and L. W. Miller. "Teacher Attitudes and Children's Behavior Problems." Educational Psychology, Vol. XXVII (1936), 501-511.

Flesher, W. R. "The Beginning Teacher." Educational Research Bulletin, Vol. XXIV (January, 1954), 12-18.

Fromm, Erich. The Art of Loving. New York: Harper Brothers, 1956.

Fromm, Erich. Man For Himself. New York: Rinehart & Company, Inc., 1947.

Garber, Lee O. "Corporal Punishment Must Be Justified." Nation's Schools, Vol. LVII (June, 1956), 79.

Gibson, Janice T. Educational Psychology. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1968.

Glasser, William. "Humanizing the Elementary School." The National Elementary Principal, Vol. XLIX, No. 1 (September, 1969), 8-18.

Greenberg, Judith W., Joan M. Greever, Jeanne Chall, and Helen H. Davidson. "Attitudes of Children From a Deprived Environment Toward Achievement Related Concepts." The Journal of Educational Research, Vol. LIX (February, 1964), 221-228.

Havighurst, Robert J., and Bernice L. Neugarten. Education and Society. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1957.

Hawk, Travis L. "School Practices and Certain Principles of Learning." The Elementary School Journal, Vol. LXIV (October, 1963), 37.

Hayes, Henry. "Some Ways To Teach Culturally Deprived Children." Chicago School Journal, Vol. XLV (February, 1964), 221-228.

Heald, James E. "In Defense of Middle Class Values." Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. XLVI (October, 1964), 81-83.

Hernandez, David E. "Is the Concept of Social Class Being Misused in Education?" The Journal of Educational Sociology, Vol. XXXVI (March, 1963), 322-328.

Hollingshead, August B. Elmstown's Youth. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1949.

Hoyt, Donald P. "College Grades and Adult Accomplishment: A Review of Research." Educational Record. (November 21, 1959), 473-474.

Hurlock, E. B., and L. C. McDonald. "Undesirable Behavior Traits in Junior High School Students." Child Development, Vol. V (1934), 278-290.

Hymes, James L. Behavior and Misbehavior: A Teacher Guide to Action. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1955.

Jenkins, D. H. "Interdependence In the Classroom." Journal of Educational Research, Vol. XLV (October, 1951), 137-144.

Jersild, Arthur T. Child Psychology. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1960.

Jersild, Arthur T. When Teachers Face Themselves. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1955.

Kaplan, Louis. "The Annoyances of Elementary School Teachers." The Journal of Educational Research, Vol. XLV (May, 1952), 649-664.

Kearney, N. C., and P. D. Rocchio. "The Effect of Teacher Education on the Teacher's Attitude." Journal of Educational Research, Vol. XLIII (May, 1956), 703-707.

Kimbrough, Ralph B. Administering Elementary Schools. New York: MacMillan Company, 1968.

Kvaraceus, William C. "Behavior Problems." Encyclopedia of Educational Research. Ed. Walter S. Monroe. New York: MacMillan Company, 1960.

Landis, Paul H. Social Problems in Nation and World. Chicago: J. B. Lippencott Co., 1959.

Laycock, S. R. "Teachers' Reactions to Maladjustment of School Children." British Journal of Educational Psychology, Vol. IV (1934), 11-19.

Leeds, Carrol H., and Walter W. Cook. "The Construction and Differential Value of a Scale for Determining Teacher-Pupil Attitudes." Journal of Experimental Education, Vol. XVI (December, 1947), 149-159.

Maslow, Abraham H. Motivation and Personality. New York: Harper Brothers, 1954.

Maslow, Abraham H. New Knowledge In Human Values. New York: Harper Brothers, 1959.

McCandless, Boyd R. Children and Adolescents: Behavior and Development. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1961.

McClure, W. E. "Characteristics of Problem Children Based on the Judgments of Teachers." Journal of Juvenile Research, Vol. XIII (1929), 124-140.

McDonnell, Gaither. "Behavior That Annoys Teachers." The Elementary School Journal, Vol. LXIII (May, 1963), 448-452.

Menninger, Karl A. Love Against Hate. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and Co., 1942.

Merton, Robert A. Social Theory and Social Structure. Glencoe: Free Press, 1957.

Metzer, Seymour. "The Teacher Preparation Myth: A Phoenix Too Frequent." Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. L, No. 2 (October, 1968), 105-106.

Meyer, Adolphe E. An Educational History of the American People. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1967.

Michaelis, John U., and Paul R. Grim. The Student Teacher in the Elementary School. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1953.

Montagu, Ashley. "The Need for Sensitivity." Association for Childhood Education, Vol. XLI, No. 4 (December, 1964), 167.

Morril, Charles L. "Behavior Problems in Junior High School." Clearing House, Vol. XXXI (March, 1957), 402.

National Education Association. "Teacher Opinion on Pupil Behavior." Research Bulletin, Vol. XXXIV, No. 2 (April, 1956), 51-107.

National Society for the Study of Education, 59th Yearbook, Part II. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960.

National Training Laboratories Institute News and Reports. Washington, D.C.: The Association, National Education Association, Vol. II, No. 2 (April, 1968).

Nelson, Robert H., and Michael L. Thompson. "Why Teachers Quit After the First Year." Clearing House, Vol. XXVII (April, 1963), 62-72.

Ohlsen, Merle M. "The Selection of Prospective Teachers." Teacher Education: The Decade Ahead. (Dekalb Conference Report, National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards.) Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1955.

Oklahoma State University Catalogue, 1968-1969.

Oklahoma State University. Thesis Writing Manual. Stillwater, 1967.

Oliva, Peter T. "High School Discipline In American Society." Bulletin of the National Secondary School Principals, Vol. XL (January, 1956), 1-38.

Oliver, William A. "Teacher's Educational Beliefs Versus Their Classroom Practices." The Journal of Educational Research, Vol. XLVII (September, 1953), 47-55.

Olsen, James. "Challenge of the Poor to the Schools." Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. XLVII (October, 1965), 80.

Otto, Henry J. Principles of Elementary Education. New York: Rinehart and Co., Inc., 1949.

Passow, A. Harry. Education In Depressed Areas. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1963.

Passow, A. Harry, and Gordon N. Mackenzie. "Research In Group Behavior." Nation's Schools, Vol. XLIX (April, 1952), 71-73.

Pickens, E. Harris. Changing Conceptions of School Discipline. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1928.

Prescott, Daniel A. The Child in the Educative Process. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1957.

Ragan, William B. Modern Elementary Curriculum. New York: Dryden Press, Inc., 1961.

Reissman, Frank. The Culturally Deprived Child. New York: Harper Brothers, 1962.

Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders. U. S. Riot Commission. New York: E. P. Dutton and Co., Inc., 1968.

Rogers, Carl R. The Clinical Treatment of the Problem Child. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1939.

Runyon, Richard P., and Audrey Haber. Fundamentals of Behavioral Statistics. Reading: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1967.

Ryans, David G. "A Study of the Extent of Association of Certain Professional and Personal Data with Judged Effectiveness of Teacher Behavior." Journal of Experimental Education (September, 1951), 67-77.

Scheuler, Herbert. "Making Teacher Education Meaningful." Phi Delta Kappan. (1967).

Schrupp, Manfred, and Clayton M. Gjerde. "Teacher Growth In Attitudes Toward Behavior Problems of Children." The Journal of Educational Psychology, Vol. XLIV (April, 1953), 203-214.

Sewell, W. H., and A. O. Haller. "Social Status and the Personality of the Child." Sociometry, Vol. XIX (1956), 114-125.

Shaplin, Judson T. "Practice in Teaching." Teacher Education: A Reappraisal. New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1962.

Shaw, Fredrick. "Educating Culturally Deprived Youth In Urban Centers." Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. XLV (November, 1963), 91.

Siegel, Sidney. Nonparametric Statistics. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1956.

Snyder, L. M. "The Problem Child in the New Jersey Elementary Schools." Journal of Educational Sociology, Vol. VII (1934), 343-352.

Sochet, Mary Allen. "Social Class Awareness of Lower Class Children As Revealed in Their Concepts of Adult Preferences, Ideals, and Self-Images." International Review of Education, Vol. XV (1964), 341-346.

Stendler, Celia Burns. "How Well Do Elementary School Teachers Understand Child Behavior?" The Journal of Educational Psychology, Vol. XL (December, 1949), 289-498.

Stinnett, T. M. "Teacher Education In Perspective." Innovation in Teacher Education. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1965.

Stouffer, George A. W., Jr. "Behavior Problems of Children As Viewed By Teachers and Mental Hygienists." Mental Hygiene, Vol. XXXVI (April, 1952), 271-285.

Symonds, Percival M. "Evaluation of Teacher Personality." Teachers College Record, Vol. XLVIII (October, 1946), 21-34.

Symonds, Percival M. "Introduction to the Special Issue on Classroom Dynamics." Journal of Educational Research, Vol. XLV (October, 1951), 81-87.

Symonds, Percival M. "What Education Has To Learn From Psychology." Teachers College Record, Vol. LVII (April, 1956), 461-462.

Teacher Education: A Reappraisal. Ed. Elmer R. Smith. New York: Harper and Row Publishers, Inc., 1962.

Thompson, G. E. Child Psychology. New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1952.

Tolor, Alexander, William L. Scarpetti, and Paul A. Lane. Parents and Teachers View the Child. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1949.

Trow, William Clark, Alvin E. Zander, William C. Morse, and David H. Jenkins. "Psychology of Group Behavior: The Class As A Group." The Journal of Educational Psychology, Vol. XLI (October, 1950), 322-338.

Turabian, Kate L. A Manual for Writers of Term Papers, Theses, and Dissertations. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1955.

University of Nebraska. "The Study of Learning and Teaching." Fifty Years of Progress in Teacher Education: 1908-1958 (August, 1958), No. 198, Number 33.

Vincent, Harold. "Are Your Teachers Handcuffed on Discipline?" School Management, Vol. VIII (April, 1964), 107-108.

Washburne, Carleton, and Louise M. Heil. "What Characteristics Affect Children's Growth." School Review (Winter, 1960), 420-428.

Watts, Gary D. "A Correlation Analysis Between Level of Achievement and Certain Teacher Characteristics in Selected School Systems." (unpublished Doctor's dissertation, Ohio University, 1964.)

Wickman, E. K. Children's Behavior and Teachers' Attitudes. New York: The Commonwealth Fund, 1928.

Willie, C. V. "Anti-Social Behavior Among Disadvantaged Youth." The Journal of Negro Education, Vol. XXXIII (Spring, 1964), 176.

Willower, Donald J., Terry L. Eidell, and Wayne K. Hoy. The School and Pupil Control Ideology. University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Studies No. 24, 1967.

Young, Masten, and Isabel. "Behavior Problems of Elementary School Children: A Description and Comparative Study." Genetic Psychology Monographs, Vol. XX (1938), 123-181.

Yourman, J. "Children Identified by Their Teachers as Problems." Journal of Educational Psychology, Vol. VI (1932), 334-343.

APPENDIX A

BEHAVIORAL PROBLEMS INVENTORY

BEHAVIORAL PROBLEMS INVENTORY *

Student teacher _____ School_____

Grade level taught or assigned_____ School system_____

Date _____ _____ 1969 Instrument code_____ Code number_____
month day

INSTRUCTIONS: In the column headed "seriousness," please check (✓) each behavior as being "High," "Medium," or "Low" in seriousness.

SERIOUSNESS			
High	Medium	Low	BEHAVIORAL PROBLEMS
			Running in the hall
			General rudeness and inconsideration for other students.
			Cheating on class assignments and/or tests
			Defacing school property and/or equipment
			Habitual tardiness
			Committing petty thievery
			Lying, untruthfulness
			Masturbation
			Truancy
			Swearing, using profane language
			Smoking
			Obscene notes, talk
			Playing with genitalia
			Disorderliness in classroom
			Whispering, writing notes
			Interrupting
			Failure to pay attention
			Carelessness, inaccuracy in work
			Physical laziness
			Willful disobedience
			Cruelty, bullying
			Quarrelsomeness
			Tattling on others
			Stubbornness, contrariness
			Rages, temper tantrums
			Rudeness, impudence to teachers
			Shyness, timidity, withdrawing
			Acting smart
			Unhappiness, depression
			Daydreaming
			Slovenly appearance
			Sissy or tomboy
			No interest in classwork
			Sex offense

*Permission for use granted.

APPENDIX B

BEHAVIORAL TREATMENT RESPONSE SHEET

BEHAVIORAL TREATMENT RESPONSE SHEET*

TREATMENTS FOR BEHAVIORAL PROBLEMS

1. Give pupil opportunity to make contribution to class
2. Pupil apologizes
3. Teacher uses simple control (a look, nod of head, etc.)
4. Parent-teacher conference
5. Teacher lowers grade
6. Detention after school
7. Pupil-teacher conference
8. Pupil temporarily suspended from room
9. Pupil temporarily suspended from school
10. Pupil loses some privilege
11. Pupil referred to special service personnel
12. Corporal punishment is used
13. Send child to principal's office
14. Role playing
15. Isolate the pupil
16. Emphasize good qualities of child's behavior
17. Accept misbehavior as normal for child and attempt to change through a positive approach
18. Physical control of student
19. Require additional assignment
20. Some action by fellow students
21. Behavior called to attention of other class members
22. Assess and improve through group discussions

BEHAVIORAL PROBLEMS

Running in the hall.....___ ___
Rudeness to class member.....___ ___
Cheating.....___ ___
Defacing property.....___ ___
Habitual tardiness.....___ ___
Petty thievery.....___ ___
Lying, untruthfulness.....___ ___
Masturbation.....___ ___
Truancy.....___ ___
Swearing.....___ ___
Smoking.....___ ___
Obscene notes, talk.....___ ___
Playing with genitalia....___ ___
Disorderliness in class...___ ___
Whispering, writing notes.___ ___
Interrupting.....___ ___
Does not pay attention....___ ___
Carelessness in work.....___ ___
Physical laziness.....___ ___
Willful disobedience.....___ ___
Cruelty, bullying.....___ ___
Quarrelsomeness.....___ ___
Tattling on others.....___ ___
Stubbornness, contrariness...___ ___
Rages, temper tantrums.....___ ___
Rudeness to teachers.....___ ___
Shyness, withdrawal.....___ ___
Acting smart.....___ ___
Unhappiness, depression.....___ ___
Daydreaming.....___ ___
Slovenly appearance.....___ ___
Sissy or tomboy.....___ ___
No interest in classwork.....___ ___
Sex offense.....___ ___
Eating candy, etc., in school___ ___
"Horseplay".....___ ___
Physical attack on teacher...___ ___
Others.....___ ___

Listed and numbered are twenty-two procedures that are thought to be effective for various behavioral problems.

For each of the behavioral problems above, which procedure or procedures would you believe to be most effective?

In the blank or blanks opposite each of the behavioral problems write in the number or numbers of the procedures you would favor.

Example: If you believe that the behavior problem of "untruthfulness" could best be treated by "Detention after school," which is number 6, then write "6" in the blank after "Untruthfulness," etc.

---

*Permission for use granted.

APPENDIX C

ADMINISTRATION INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE BEHAVIORAL PROBLEMS INVENTORY AND THE BEHAVIORAL PROBLEMS TREATMENT SHEET

ADMINISTRATION INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE BEHAVIORAL PROBLEMS INVENTORY AND THE BEHAVIORAL PROBLEMS TREATMENT SHEET

READ ALOUD TO THE GROUP:

Your participation is desired in collecting data for a College of Education project in research related to student teaching and teacher education.

This two part instrument is designed to record your responses to your perception of behavioral problems observed in elementary school age pupils. It also will allow you to propose a treatment of your choice for each of the behavioral problems listed.

The data collected by this two part instrument will be analyzed by groups and NO REFERENCE TO ANY INDIVIDUAL WILL BE MADE. The instrument requires your name in order to facilitate groupings, to identify the sex of the participant and to identify each completed inventory as that of a qualified Oklahoma State University Student Teacher Candidate enrolled in student teaching this term.

INSTRUCTIONS: (READ ALOUD TO THE GROUP)

In the heading of the Inventory on page 1, fill in your name. The date is March 4, 1969. The instrument code is our 4450 section number.

In the Inventory body of page 1, there are listed, to the right of the page, thirty-seven behavioral problems of elementary school age pupils. Immediately to the left, there are three columns entitled "HIGH SERIOUSNESS," "MEDIUM SERIOUSNESS," and "LOW SERIOUSNESS." Please check (✓) each behavior as you perceive it as one of these. Simply record your immediate response--do not intellectualize the item. Do not proceed to page two until all items have been checked.

In the Inventory body of page 2, there are listed and numbered, twenty-two procedures which are thought to be effective for various behavioral problems in elementary school age children. For each of the behavioral problems found in the center section of page 2, followed by blanks, decide which procedure or procedures listed at the top of the page you believe to be most effective and appropriate. In the blanks opposite each of the behavioral problems, write in the number or numbers of the procedures you would favor.

EXAMPLE: (READ ALOUD TO THE GROUP)

If you believe that the behavior problem of "Untruthfulness" could best be treated by "Detention after school," which is number 6, then write "6" in the blank after "Untruthfulness," etc. Please complete all examples on pages 1 and 2.

QUESTIONS? - Begin.